

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

Edited by H. CARRINGTON LANCASTER

GUSTAV GRUENBAUM

WILLIAM MURRELMAYER

JOSÉ ROBLES

RAYMOND D. HAVENS

KEMP MALONE

HAZELTON SPENCER

CONTENTS

	PAGE
BÉDÉ, JEAN-ALBERT.—Chateaubriand and Marcel Proust.	353
SEENER, EDWARD D.—Perry as an Opponent of Slavery.	360
EDWARDS, BATEMAN.—An Unpublished Fragment of <i>Qui se Combait</i> 'Vengeant Alexandre.'	366
PAUL, HENRY H.—Players' Quartos and Duodecimos of 'Hamlet.'	369
PARROTT, THOMAS MARC.—Errors and Omissions in the Griggs Facsimile of the Second Quarto of 'Hamlet.'	376
CAIN, H. EDWARD.—Marlowe's "French Crowns."	380
ALLEN, DON CAMERON.—A Source for 'Cambises.'	384
NEILL, KERRY.—Spenser's 'Shamefastness,' 'Faerie Queene,' II, ix, 43-44.	397
McMAHAWAY, JAMES G.—"Occasion," 'Faerie Queene,' II, ix, 4-5.	391
FAUST, GEORGE P.—A Spenser Parallel.	393
BROWN, CARLETON.—Sermons and Miracle Plays.	394
ACKEEMAN, ROBERT W.—Texts: 'Knight's Tale' 2499.	397
MASSEY, B. W. A.—The Division of Words.	400
WILLIAMS, RONALD B.—An Omission From Curme's 'Syntax.'	404
AUBIN, ROBERT A.—A Note on Eighteenth-Century Program Pieces.	405
AVERY, EMMETT L.—An Early Performance of Fielding's 'Historical Register.'	407

REVIEWS.—

A. PILLET and H. CARSTENS, <i>Bibliographie des Troubadours</i> . [W. P. Shepard.]	408
J. A. BALBUENO, <i>Novelistas españoles modernos</i> . [José Robles.]	410
H. VAN WIJNGAARDEN, <i>Les Ouyssades philosophiques en France entre 1616 et 1789</i> ; F. LACHÈVRE, <i>Le Royaume d'Antan</i> . [G. Uhlenberg.]	413
C. B. LEWIS, <i>Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romances</i> . [H. E. Patch.]	416
W. B. GATES, <i>The Dramatic Works and Translations of Sir William Lower</i> . [K. M. Lynch.]	418
E. J. WINGARD, <i>Thomas Mann's Novel 'Der Embelberg'</i> . [A. H. Sacher.]	419

BRIEF MENTION: F. BALDERSPERGER, *Alfred de Vigny*; M. E. GOURAND, *Étude sur les Épîtres Morales d'Honoré d'Urfé*; J. J. HAY, *Frische Dialectgeographie*; JOHN E. ROSS, *The Social Criticism of Fenimore Cooper*; L. ANSCHUTZ, etc., *Aspects of Shakespeare*.

CORRESPONDENCE: Longfellow "Undiscovered."

NEUROLOGY, David S. Bloodstein.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year.—Single Copy (Current) Seventy-Two Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103.

Act of Congress of July 16, 1879.

MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A Monthly Publication with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

EDITED BY

H. Carrington Lancaster, Gustav Gruenbaum, W. Kurrelmeyer,
Raymond D. Havens, Kemp Malone, H. Spencer, and J. Reblee

ADVISORY EDITORS

G. Chinard, E. Feise, J. C. French, R. B. Roulston, L. P. Shanks

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$5.00
for the United States and Mexico and \$5.50 for other countries
included in the Postal Union. Single issues, price seventy-five cents.

Contributors and Publishers should send manuscripts and books for review to the Editors of Modern Language Notes, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md., indicating on the envelope whether the contribution concerns English, German, or Romance. Every manuscript should be accompanied by a stamped and addressed return envelope. In accepting articles for publication, the editors will give preference to those submitted by subscribers to the journal. Foot-notes should be numbered continuously throughout each article; titles of books and journals should be italicized; titles of articles enclosed in quotation marks. Quotation marks are not used in verse quotations that form a paragraph. Write II, 3, not vol. II, p. 3. The following abbreviations are approved: *DNB.*, *JEGP.*, *MLN.*, *MLR.*, *MP.*, *NED.*, *PMLA.*, *PQ.*, *RR.*, *SP.*, *RES.*, *TLS.* Proof and MS. should be returned to the editors with an indication of the total number of reprints desired. Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to The Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

The Axiochus of Plato translated by

EDMUND SPENSER

Edited with an introduction by

FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD

IN THE Preface to his edition of Spenser's *Faerie Queene*, published in 1758, John Upton remarked, "'Tis not my design to enter into any minute inquiry of his other writings; for that shall be kept for a third Volume; which will contain his Pastorals, Sonnets, etc., together with his View of the State of Ireland, and a translation of a Socratic dialogue, entitled Axiochus or of Death; which is not taken notice of by any Editor of any part of his works." Upton died two years later, and the projected volume, with its promise of the *Axiochus*, was never published. From that time to the present scholars have searched in vain for this "lost" dialogue. Recently a copy, fortunately preserved by being inlaid in a volume of the 1679 folio edition of Spenser, came into the possession of Professor Frederick Morgan Padelford. Since the announcement of the discovery at the 1932 meeting of the Modern Language Association, scholars have naturally been impatient to have access to this recovered work. The Johns Hopkins Press is now able to announce the publication of an edition of the dialogue, photographically reproduced, and edited with an introduction and notes, by Mr. Padelford.

90 pages, octavo, cloth, \$2.75

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE

Modern Language Notes

Volume XLIX

JUNE, 1934

Number 6

CHATEAUBRIAND ET MARCEL PROUST

Soucieux d'apparenter son inspiration et sa technique "à des traits moins marqués, mais reconnaissables, discernables et, au fond, assez analogues chez certains écrivains," Marcel Proust a pris soin d'indiquer lui-même (*Temps Retrouvé*, II, 82) la lignée littéraire dont son œuvre est issue: et il cite, dans l'ordre, Chateaubriand, Gérard de Nerval et Baudelaire. Sans doute le dernier nommé est-il son plus proche parent par la doctrine et les affinités; mais Chateaubriand garde à ses yeux le prestige particulier qu'il eut, en fait, pour tout le dix-neuvième siècle: celui de l'aïeul et du pionnier.

La critique a doté Marcel Proust d'une foule de devanciers et d'émules spirituels,—la plupart imaginaires; par contre, elle s'est montrée singulièrement discrète en ce qui concerne l'influence de Chateaubriand.¹ Pour rendre à celui-ci la justice qui lui est due, relisons, s'il vous plaît, cette importante page 82, et voyons avec quelle remarquable sûreté de goût Marcel Proust extrait des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe* deux passages des plus significatifs et,—le second surtout,—d'une résonance toute moderne:

N'est-ce pas,—écrit-il,—à mes sensations du genre de celle de la madeleine qu'est suspendue la plus belle partie des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*: "Hier au soir, je me promenais seul . . . Je fus tiré de mes réflexions par le gazouillement d'une grive perchée sur la plus haute branche d'un bouleau. A l'instant, ce son magique fit reparaître à mes yeux le domaine paternel; j'oubliai les catastrophes dont je venais d'être le témoin et,

¹ Le regretté Arnaud Dandieu, dont l'ouvrage: *Marcel Proust, sa révélation psychologique* (Paris, Didot, 1930), a renouvelé la critique proustienne, cite intégralement, aux pp. 92-93 de son propre livre, le passage du *Temps Retrouvé* sur Chateaubriand. Mais il n'entrait nullement dans son sujet de développer un parallèle entre l'auteur du *Côté de chez Swann* et celui des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*.

transporté subitement dans le passé, je revis ces campagnes où j'entendis si souvent siffler la grive." Et une des deux ou trois plus belles phrases de ces *Mémoires* n'est-elle pas celle-ci: "Une odeur fine et suave d'héliotrope s'exhalait d'un petit carré de fèves en fleurs; elle ne nous était point apportée par une brise de la patrie, mais par un vent sauvage de Terre-Neuve, sans relation avec la plante exilée, sans sympathie de réminiscence et de volupté. Dans ce parfum, non respiré de la beauté, non épuré dans son sein, non répandu sur ses traces, dans ce parfum chargé d'aurore, de culture et de monde, il y avait toutes les mélancolies des regrets, de l'absence et de la jeunesse."²

C'est en juillet 1817 qu'un tout petit incident,—le gazouillement de la grive,—ramène Chateaubriand au cœur même des bruyères bretonnes et de son adolescence. Marcel Proust en est frappé parce qu'il s'agit là, non point d'une évocation ordinaire de la mémoire intellectuelle, mais d'une véritable résurrection du passé opérée par la mémoire affective. La mémoire volontaire donne des renseignements sur le passé; seule, la mémoire affective a le pouvoir féérique de le faire revivre à notre usage. Il suffit,—mais cette sensation même est très rare, et Proust s'estime fortuné pour l'avoir éprouvée six ou sept fois dans sa vie,—il suffit d'un ébranlement fortuit venu de l'extérieur:

Qu'un bruit, qu'une odeur, déjà entendu ou respirée jadis, le soient de nouveau, à la fois dans le présent et dans le passé . . . aussitôt l'essence permanente et habituellement cachée des choses se trouve libérée et notre vrai moi qui parfois depuis longtemps, semblait mort, mais ne l'était pas autrement, s'éveille, s'anime en recevant la céleste nourriture qui lui est apportée. Une minute affranchie de l'ordre du temps a recréé en nous pour la sentir l'homme affranchi de l'ordre du temps.³

Proust nous prévient d'ailleurs qu'il trouve fort raisonnable la croyance celtique selon laquelle l'âme des morts, l'âme du passé tout entier, se dissimule, muette et captive, dans un humble objet: une pierre, un toit, un son de cloche, une odeur de feuilles; se dissimule, muette, captive, et perdue pour nous jusqu'au jour, qui pour beaucoup ne vient jamais, où un hasard heureux nous découvre sa prison et nous permet de lui rendre la parole et la vie.⁴

² Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, édition Biré, I, 125 et 343.

³ *Le Temps Retrouvé*, II, 16.

⁴ Cf. *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 45-46 et 166. De même, les émotions de Chateaubriand sont associées à de minuscules épisodes de la vie de la nature: le vent du soir qui brise les réseaux tendus par l'insecte sur la pointe des herbes; l'alouette de bruyère qui se pose sur un caillou (cf. *Mémoires*

Ainsi donc, et à la lettre, Combourg se trouvait enclos, donjon et forêts, dans le sifflement d'une grive, de même que Combray le devait être, ville et jardins, dans la saveur d'une madeleine et d'une tasse de thé. Et bien plus que Combourg, bien plus que Combray : tout le temps révolu, toute la jeunesse. Le temps perdu, en effet, ce n'est pas seulement le temps gaspillé aux frivolités et aux passions ; c'est le temps où les chimères, n'ayant point encore été passées au feu de l'expérience, étaient bel et bien des réalités, et où l'on ne savait pas le visage de la mort. Au milieu de l'écoulement des choses, de la disparition des êtres et de la chute des illusions, Chateaubriand s'accroche à Combourg et Marcel Proust à Combray comme au seul "gisement profond du sol mental," au seul "terrain résistant" où s'appuyer encore. "La plupart de mes sentiments,—avoue Chateaubriand,—sont demeurés au fond de mon âme. . . . Je veux remonter le penchant de mes belles années." Combray,—dit Marcel Proust,—a "constitué à tout jamais pour moi la figure des pays où j'aimerais vivre."⁵ Les fleurs qu'il n'a point rencontrées du côté de Guermantes ou de Méséglise ne lui semblent point de vraies fleurs, et, lui montrât-on de plus beaux nymphéas que ceux de la Vivonne, cette flore familière, mais transplantée, ne le satisferait guère davantage :

Ce que je veux revoir,—s'écrie-t-il,⁶—c'est le côté de Guermantes que j'ai connu . . . ce sont ces prairies où, quand le soleil les rend réfléchissantes comme une mare, se dessinent les feuilles des pommiers, c'est ce paysage dont parfois, la nuit dans mes rêves, l'individualité m'étreint avec une puissance presque fantastique et que je ne peux plus retrouver au réveil.

Ainsi rejoint-il la méditation poignante de Chateaubriand devant un carré de fleurs d'Europe, en exil, comme lui-même, au pied des mornes solitaires de Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon, et qui lui parlent des vrais, des seuls paradis,—les paradis qu'on a perdus.⁷

Que Marcel Proust soit un romantique, c'est-à-dire avant tout un émotif et un inspiré, nul ne peut en douter sérieusement aujourd'hui. On a prétendu, non sans raison, qu'il n'avait fait que

d'Outre-Tombe, I, 152). Ces menues notations relèvent d'un art impressionniste très original à son époque.

⁵ Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 4, et *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 170.

⁶ *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 171.

⁷ Cf. *Le Temps Retrouvé*, II, 13.

recommencer le *Lac* et la *Tristesse d'Olympio*: mais combien serait-il plus juste encore de dire qu'il a recommencé Combourg!

Il n'y a pas lieu, je crois,—parce que nous entrerions dans le domaine des hypothèses aventureuses,—d'insister sur la consonance fraternelle des noms de Combray et de Combourg. On ne saurait non plus faire grand état de l'existence, à Combourg comme à Combray, de deux côtés individuels et nettement différenciés: le nord et l'ouest, où s'étendent les grands bois, comme dans la direction de Méséglise; le midi et l'est, où sont le village, l'étang, les prairies et les saules, comme dans celle de Guermantes.⁸ Pareille opposition, chez Chateaubriand, demeure une pure matière de points cardinaux, et l'on ne voit pas qu'il ait reconstruit et "stylisé" ces deux aspects de la nature, pour en faire des pôles distincts de son imagination et de son cœur.

En revanche, tous les thèmes de paysage et de rêverie romantiques légués au dix-neuvième siècle par le livre III des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, nous les retrouvons, reproduits et amplifiés, dans le miroir proustien. C'est le vent, "génie particulier de Combray," qui parcourt les champs tel "un chemineau invisible," et qui fait s'envoler les corbeaux.⁹ C'est la lune, entrevue l'après-midi,—car Proust se couchait de bonne heure,—ou qui glisse jusqu'au pied du lit "son échelle enchantée".¹⁰ C'est le soleil, fidèle compagnon des songeries au bord de l'eau.¹¹ C'est la pluie, "dont le ciel est plus obscurci qu'au départ des hirondelles."¹² C'est l'automne, la saison entre les saisons, où Proust part à l'aventure, drapé dans un grand plaid à rayures écossaises, et lutte avec allégresse contre les éléments déchaînés.¹³ C'est l'exaltation qui se dégage de la solitude, et celle qui naît, vague et précise tout à

⁸ Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 73-74.

⁹ Cf. *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 136, 140, etc.

¹⁰ Cf. *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 13 et 136-137. Chateaubriand dit pareillement: "Lorsque la lune brillait et qu'elle s'abaissait à l'occident, j'en étais averti par ses rayons, qui venaient à mon lit au travers des carreaux losangés de la fenêtre" (*Mémoires*, I, 137).

¹¹ Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 153, et *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 153, 158, etc.

¹² Cf. *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 140. Est-ce une réminiscence et une transposition du départ des hirondelles chez Chateaubriand? (*Mémoires*, I, 155).

¹³ Cf. *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 142-145.

la fois, du désir adolescent d'une femme: paysanne de Rous-sainville,¹⁴ visage, déjà plus irréel, de Gilberte Swann,¹⁵ ou princesse lointaine, imaginaire et aristocratique comme la sylphide de Chateaubriand:

Je rêvais que Mme de Guermentes me faisait venir dans le parc de son château, éprise pour moi d'un soudain caprice. Tout le jour elle y pêchait la truite avec moi. Et le soir me tenant par la main, en passant devant les petits jardins de ses vassaux, elle me montrait le long des murs bas, les fleurs qui y appuient leurs quenouilles violettes et rouges, et m'apprenait leurs noms.¹⁶

C'est encore le retour au crépuscule, le cœur lourd et révolté contre les êtres et les choses qui ne répondent pas à son appel:

En vain, tenant l'étendue dans le champ de ma vision, je la drainais de mes regards qui eussent voulu en ramener une femme. . . . Je fixais indéfiniment le tronc d'un arbre lointain, de derrière lequel elle allait surgir et venir à moi; l'horizon scruté restait désert, la nuit tombait, c'était sans espoir que mon attention s'attachait, comme pour aspirer les créatures qu'ils pouvaient recéler, à ce sol stérile, à cette terre épuisée.¹⁷

Et c'est enfin, en accord avec l'inquiétude sentimentale, la naissance de l'inquiétude intellectuelle; l'anxiété de vivre, de vieillir et de mourir sans rien faire ni trouver de plus que les autres hommes; la persuasion d'être nul, "incapable de s'élever au-dessus du vulgaire"; la conviction de n'avoir "pas de génie," "pas de dispositions pour les lettres,"¹⁸ qui n'est, après tout, que la première forme, et très normale, du tourment d'écrire.

Les coquelicots du côté de Méséglise, hissant leur flamme rouge au-dessus de leur bouée grasseuse et noire, faisaient battre le cœur de Proust, "comme au voyageur qui aperçoit sur une terre basse une première barque échouée que répare un calfat, et s'écrie, avant de l'avoir encore vue: La Mer!"¹⁹ Ce rivage symbolique, promis à son attente, c'est, bien entendu, l'œuvre qu'il porte en lui, sans rien savoir de son nom, de sa forme, de son contenu. Il n'en prendra conscience que beaucoup plus tard, quand sa propre vie

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 145-147.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, I, 132-133.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 160.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 147.

¹⁸ Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 159, et *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 160 et 165.

¹⁹ *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 130.

lui aura confirmé la leçon secrète et diffuse des *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*: à savoir, qu'il n'existe pas de littérature du présent. Comme la mémoire jaillit de l'oubli, la création artistique jaillit de l'absence. Pour que Combours, ou Combray, deviennent objets de littérature, il faut, non les posséder, mais les avoir d'abord possédés et perdus. Or précisément, ces mêmes sensations, éprouvées à la fois dans le passé et dans le présent, dont nous avons vu qu'elles constituent les sommets de l'expérience intime, satisfont tout aussi bien à l'exigence contradictoire d'actualité et d'absence qui est le principe de l'œuvre d'art. Le rôle de l'artiste est donc de les saisir au passage pour cristalliser le sentiment d'éternité qu'elles dégagent, en quelque sorte, à l'état volatil, et l'œuvre d'art fonde ses prétentions à la durée, non point, cela va de soi, sur le papillotement des images, comme le croyait le snob Legrandin; non pas même sur les jeux de l'intelligence, comme l'écrivain Bergotte en avait trop longtemps nourri l'illusion, mais sur ces révélations infréquentes, fugitives et sans prix, dont la "gouttelette presque impalpable" soutient victorieusement "l'édifice immense du souvenir."²⁰

Ce n'est donc plus l'âme seule qu'une minute affranchie de l'ordre du temps transporte, pour la sentir, hors des frontières du temps: le testament que cette âme laisse à la postérité participe du même privilège et le consacre à tout jamais. Combours, beaucoup moins décrit que transcrit sous la dictée naïve d'un oiseau; Combray, respiré et reconnu dans le parfum d'une tasse de thé, ne sont plus mesurables en termes de passé ni de présent, et tout effort pour les "situer" dans le courant des jours est voué à l'impuissance:

Parfois,—confesse Marcel Proust,²¹—ce morceau de paysage amené ainsi jusqu'à aujourd'hui se détache si isolé de tout qu'il flotte incertain dans ma pensée comme une Délos fleurie, sans que je puisse dire de quel pays, de quel temps,—peut-être tout simplement de quel rêve,—il vient.

Et Chateaubriand, pour une fois, fournit un témoignage plus proustien que celui de Proust lui-même:

Les divers sentiments de mes âges divers, ma jeunesse pénétrant dans ma vieillesse, la gravité de mes années d'expérience attristant mes années légères, les rayons de mon soleil, depuis son aurore jusqu'à son couchant, se croisant et se confondant comme les reflets épars de mon existence,

²⁰ *Ibid.*, I, 48.

²¹ *Ibid.*, I, 170.

donnent une sorte d'unité indéfinissable à mon travail : mon berceau a de ma tombe, ma tombe a de mon berceau ; mes souffrances deviennent des plaisirs, mes plaisirs des douleurs, et l'on ne sait si ces *Mémoires* sont l'ouvrage d'une tête brune ou chenue." ²²

Il convient donc de soustraire ces paysages, ces états d'âme "retrouvés," aux fluctuations et aux contingences de la durée concrète, qui n'est pas, ou qui n'est plus, leur véritable élément. Rendus à leur sphère intemporelle, dûment situés au-dessus et au-delà de la vie et de la mort, ils acquièrent au contraire une fixité, une individualité, une nécessité quasi mystiques. Chateaubriand voit l'objet comme s'il était devant ses yeux ; son cœur bat au point de repousser la table sur laquelle il écrit : et cependant, que signifie tout cela pour le reste des hommes ?

J'ai eu,—dit-il,—à réveiller un monde qui n'était connu que de moi ; je n'ai rencontré, en errant dans cette société évanouie, que des souvenirs et le silence ; de toutes les personnes que j'ai connues, combien en existe-t-il aujourd'hui ?

A quoi Proust répond, comme en écho :

Ce coin de nature, ce bout de jardin n'eussent pu penser que ce serait grâce à un enfant qu'ils seraient appelés à survivre en leurs particularités les plus éphémères ; et pourtant, . . . mon exaltation les a portés et a réussi à leur faire traverser tant d'années successives, tandis qu'alentour les chemins se sont effacés et que sont morts ceux qui les foulèrent et le souvenir de ceux qui les foulèrent. ²³

L'œuvre d'art, où se réfugie et s'apaise cette exaltation, surgit donc au milieu des ruines comme une consolation et une espérance. Ce fut son rôle constant à travers toutes les variations doctrinales du dix-neuvième siècle. Elle est une revanche sur la vie et une conquête, au moins partielle, sur la mort. Elle a une signification religieuse. Les *Mémoires* de Chateaubriand sont un temple,—un temple dédié à la Mort,—un temple toutefois, qu'il élève à la clarté de ses souvenirs. ²⁴ L'œuvre de Proust, d'une architecture plus païenne, n'en baigne pas moins dans la même lumière et témoigne du même besoin. Que l'art soit la préfiguration d'une vie future ne lui paraît pas une idée sans vraisemblance. Il aime croire que

²² *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, xlviii (*Préface testamentaire*).

²³ *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, liv (*Avant-Propos*), et *Du Côté de chez Swann*, I, 170.

²⁴ Cf. *Mémoires d'Outre-Tombe*, I, 4.

Ver Meer n'eût pas peint avec tant de science et d'amour un tout petit pan de mur jaune s'il n'eût dû recueillir, dans un monde meilleur, fondé sur le scrupule et le sacrifice, sa justification et sa récompense; et, sur la couche funèbre de Bergotte, il imagine ses livres, disposés trois par trois derrière les vitrines, qui veillent, comme des anges aux ailes éployées, en symbole de résurrection.²⁵

JEAN-ALBERT BÉDÉ

Princeton University

PARNY AS AN OPPONENT OF SLAVERY

The majority of modern critics have summarily banished Evariste Parny from the society of the more significant French poets. This hostility may be explained largely as a reaction against his later poetry, which is admittedly inferior, and particularly against his infamous poem, *La Guerre des Dieux*. Some years ago, Faguet said, in a public lecture on Parny, "De tous les poètes français, et même de tous les poètes de l'univers, Parny est celui pour lequel j'ai le mépris le plus profond."¹ Potez, granting the importance of Parny's influence on elegiac verse, declares that "si l'on en excepte ses *Poésies érotiques*, toute son œuvre, ou peu s'en faut, est au-dessous du médiocre,"² while the poet lies buried in a long footnote to Lanson's section on "La Poésie sans poésie."³ Through an unwarranted suppression of certain aspects of Parny's works, these judgments, on whatever basis they are made, create a totally inadequate picture of the poet's contribution to eighteenth-century thought.

Because of his active interest in Negro slavery, Parny deserves recognition as a participant in one of the most conspicuous humanitarian movements of his century. The establishment of this point will make it less easy to class Parny, as Lanson does, with those poets in whose works "on ne rencontre pas un éclat de passion, pas une impression, pas une image: aucune trace fraîche enfin

²⁵ Cf. *La Prisonnière*, I, 256.

¹ *Revue des cours et conférences*, No. 9 (1907), p. 402.

² *L'Élégie en France avant le romantisme*, Paris, 1897, p. 88.

³ *Histoire de la littérature française*, 22d ed., revised; Paris, n. d., p. 641.

de la nature ou de la vie";⁴ nor will it appear wholly true, as Potez thinks, that Parny "n'a point la préoccupation des mœurs variées et des usages pittoresques qui se rencontrent parmi les peuples."⁵

Such preoccupation, on the contrary, is manifest not only in several of Parny's poems, but even more prominently in his epistolary poetry. In his youth and during his travels he had witnessed and denounced the abuses to which the unfortunate slaves were subjected in his native Ile Bourbon and in South America. At the age of twenty he wrote to his brother from Rio de Janeiro, describing the charms of that "paradis terrestre." He concludes that à tous ces avantages il en manque un, qui seul peut donner du prix aux autres, c'est la liberté: tout est ici dans l'esclavage; on y peut entrer, mais on n'en sort guère. En général les colons sont mécontents et fatigués de leur sort.⁶

Returning to the Ile Bourbon after a short residence in Paris, Parny wrote in 1775 to his friend, Bertin:

Je te sais bon gré, mon ami, de ne pas oublier les Nègres dans les instructions que tu me demandes⁷. . . Non, je ne saurais me plaire dans un pays où mes regards ne peuvent tomber que sur le spectacle de la servitude, où le

⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 641.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 110.

⁶ *Œuvres d'Evariste Parny*, Paris, 1808, I, 216-217.

⁷ *Ibid.*, p. 230. While Bertin, too, was a Creole poet, his published works, *Poésies et oeuvres diverses*, Paris, 1879, contain but one significant reference to the Negro race:

Vous verriez bien, troupe insensée,
Qui n'avez point de Colisée,
De grands sauteurs, ni d'arlequins,
Que d'un Dieu bienfaisant et sage
Nous seuls annonçons le dessein:
L'Européen est son ouvrage;
Mais le nez plat d'un Africain
Ne sauroit être à son image.

Aux Sauvages, p. 229.

It is interesting to notice that Bertin, in this ironical pretense of anthropological superiority, utilizes not the color of the skin, but the same facial trait as does Montesquieu, in an equally ironical passage of the *Esprit des lois*: "Ceux dont il s'agit sont noirs depuis les pieds jusqu'à la tête, et ils ont le nez si écrasé qu'il est presque impossible de les plaindre." (Livre xv, chap. v.) Cf. also Voltaire, *Lettres d'Amabed* (1769), No. 7: "Nos sages ont dit que l'homme est l'image de Dieu: voilà une plaisante image de l'Etre éternel qu'un nez noir épaté. . ."

bruit des fouets et des chaînes étourdit mon oreille et retentit dans mon cœur. Je ne vois que des tyrans et des esclaves, et je ne vois pas mon semblable. On troque tous les jours un homme contre un cheval: il est impossible que je m'accoutume à une bizarrerie si révoltante.⁸

This long letter shows clearly that Parny's interest in slavery was by no means transitory. His zeal was unfeigned, and his criticism was founded on close observation. He notices, for example, the general dissatisfaction with the slaves' excessively hard labor:

... ils ont la pioche à la main depuis quatre heures du matin jusqu'au coucher du soleil; mais leur maître, en revenant d'examiner leur ouvrage, répète tous les soirs: "Ces gueux-là ne travaillent point"; mais ils sont esclaves, mon ami; cette idée doit bien empoisonner le maïs qu'ils dévorent et qu'ils détrempent de leur sueur.⁹

The Negroes' nostalgia, which was an important factor in explaining the ineptitude of the imported slaves, is touchingly described and, too, the futility of attempting escape by water to a more friendly soil:

Leur patrie est à deux cents lieues d'ici; ils s'imaginent cependant entendre le chant des coqs, et reconnaître la fumée des pipes de leurs camarades. Ils s'échappent quelquefois au nombre de douze ou quinze, enlèvent une pirogue, et s'abandonnent sur flots. Ils y laissent presque toujours la vie; et c'est peu de chose, lorsqu'on a perdu la liberté. Quelques uns cependant sont arrivés à Madagascar; mais leurs compatriotes les ont tous massacrés, disant qu'ils revenaient d'avec les blancs, et qu'ils avaient trop d'esprit.¹⁰

Parny is shocked at the callousness of the fugitive slave hunters: Aujourd'hui les colons sont en sûreté. On a détruit presque tous les marons; ¹¹ des gens payés par la commune en font leur métier, et ils vont à la chasse des hommes aussi gaîment qu'à celle des merles.¹²

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 231.

¹⁰ *Ibid.* Two years earlier, Bernardin de Saint-Pierre, whose exotic descriptions were envied by Parny, had related a similar situation in his *Voyage à l'île de France*:

les uns se pendent ou s'empoisonnent; d'autres se mettent dans une pirogue, et sans voiles, sans vivres, sans boussole, se hasardent à faire un trajet de deux cents lieues de mer pour retourner à Madagascar. On en a vu aborder; on les a repris et rendus à leurs maîtres. (Lettre XII.)

¹¹ *Maron* (modern spelling *marron*), "fugitive slave," < S. Amer. Spanish *cimarrón*.

¹² *Op. cit.*, p. 232. Cf. Bernardin de Saint-Pierre:

Pour l'ordinaire ils se réfugient dans les bois, où on leur donne la chasse

The brutalization and corruption of the white children on the island through their daily contacts with slaves is a noxious situation attested alike by Parny and Bernardin de Saint-Pierre.¹³ Parny's remarks on the failure of the Christian clergy to adapt their efforts to the capacities and needs of the slave population are particularly interesting:

Ils reconnaissent un Etre suprême. On leur apprend le catéchisme; on prétend leur expliquer l'évangile; Dieu sait s'ils en comprennent le premier mot! on les baptise pourtant bon gré, malgré, après quelques jours d'instruction qui n'instruit point. J'en vis un dernièrement qu'on avait arraché de sa patrie depuis sept mois; il se laissait mourir de faim. Comme il était sur le point d'expirer, et très éloigné de la paroisse, on me pria de lui conférer le baptême. Il me regarda en souriant, et me demanda pourquoi je lui jetais de l'eau sur la tête: je lui expliquai de mon mieux la chose; mais il se retourna d'un autre côté, disant en mauvais français: Après la mort tout est fini, du moins pour nous autres Nègres; je ne veux point d'une autre vie, car peut-être y serais-je encore votre esclave.¹⁴

This anecdote may well have been suggested to Parny by the current story of the West Indian cacique, first told by Las Casas in his *Brevissima relacion de la destruccion de las Indias* (1552):

Hatuey . . . fut condamné à mourir dans le feu. On l'attache au poteau qu'entoure le bûcher; un religieux franciscain l'exhorte à se faire chrétien, et lui promet qu'il ira droit dans le ciel. Le cacique lui dit: "Quelles gens y trouve-t-on? Les chrétiens y vont-ils aussi?—Oui, répond le religieux, s'ils sont bons.—Si cela est, réplique l'Indien, je ne veux pas m'y trouver avec eux. J'aime mieux descendre dans l'enfer, pour avoir loin de moi une race si cruelle."¹⁵

The story appears also in Voltaire's *Essai sur les mœurs* (1756),¹⁶ and in John Barrow's *Collection of Voyages*,¹⁷ translated into French in 1766, as well as in Raynal, *Histoire des deux Indes* (1770).

avec des détachements de soldats, de nègres et de chiens; il y a des habitants qui s'en font une partie de plaisir. On les relance comme des bêtes sauvages. . . . *Loc. cit.*

¹³ These passages have been recorded by Potez, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-91, and later in W. M. Kerby, *The Life, Diplomatic Career and Literary Activities of Nicholas Germain Léonard*, Paris, 1925, p. 330.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, pp. 232-233.

¹⁵ *Œuvres de Las Casas*, ed. J. A. Llorente, Paris, 1822, I, 23.

¹⁶ Chap. cxlviii, "De la conquête du Pérou." Ed. Moland, Paris, 1877-83, XII, 401-402.

¹⁷ First ed. 1763. Translated title, *Abrégé chronologique ou histoire des découvertes faites par les Européens dans les différentes parties du monde* etc. The anecdote is found in the translation, II, 445.

Moreover, the response of Parny's Negro, "après la mort tout est fini," falsifies the well-known belief that the unhappy wretches will return, after death, to their native lands. An anecdote concerning this belief is found as early as 1722 in Labat's *Nouveau voyage aux îles de l'Amérique*.¹⁸ Parny was not unaware of this tradition; in fact, he used it in his poem *Les Paradis*:

Un autre espoir séduit le Nègre infortuné;
Qu'un marchand arracha des déserts de l'Afrique.
Courbé sous un joug despotique,
Dans un long esclavage il languit enchaîné:
Mais quand la mort propice a fini ses misères,
Il revole joyeux au pays de ses pères,
Et cet heureux retour est suivi d'un repas.¹⁹

Going even farther than the numerous poets of his time who, like himself, had attacked slavery, Parny attempted to convey to his contemporaries some notion of the primitivistic poetry of the Africans. His translation of native African songs into French has aptly suggested a kinship with James Macpherson's alleged transcription of Gaelic poems;²⁰ and whether true or false to their African models, the *Chansons madécasses* (1787) were the first French venture in this realm of exotic poetry.

Dussault wrote of Parny, in 1814, as

l'écrivain qui devoit parmi nous exprimer et peindre, avec tant d'énergie et de vérité, les feux, les félicités et les tourmens de cette passion, dont les ardeurs sont plus vivement ressenties sous le ciel embrasé des tropiques.²¹

These qualities appear conspicuously in the *Chansons madécasses*, which were zealously admired by Parny's friend, Chateaubriand. Professor Chinard has noted that "dans la note VI du deuxième volume du *Génie du christianisme* [1st. ed. only], Chateaubriand a reproduit la douzième chanson, comme un exemple des 'chan-

¹⁸ I, 446.

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, I, 29.

²⁰ The more so because the authenticity of the *Chansons madécasses* has been questioned by M. Désiré Laverdant, whom Saint-Beuve quotes as concluding that: "Il [Parny] a inventé . . . les nuances de sentiment, les caractères qu'il prête à cet état de société, et jusqu'aux noms propres; c'est Parny, enfin, du sauvage très agréablement embelli." *Portraits contemporains*, Paris, 1870, IV, 448 n.

²¹ *Annales littéraires*, Paris, 1818, IV, 391.

sons des nègres et des sauvages'";²² and, furthermore, that Parny is the principal source of the African exoticism in *Les Natchez*.²³

Two of the *Chansons madécasses* reflect Parny's continued interest in Negro slavery. *Chanson IX* follows:

Une mère traînait sur le rivage sa fille unique, pour la vendre aux blancs.
O ma mère! ton sein m'a portée; je suis le premier fruit de tes amours:
qu'ai-je fait pour mériter l'esclavage? j'ai soulagé ta vieillesse; pour toi j'ai
cultivé la terre; pour toi j'ai cueilli des fruits; pour toi j'ai fait la guerre
aux poissons du fleuve; je t'ai garantie de la froidure; je t'ai portée,
durant la chaleur, sous des ombrages parfumés; je veillais sur ton sommeil,
et j'écartais de ton visage les insectes importuns. O ma mère, que
deviendras-tu sans moi? L'argent que tu vas recevoir ne te donnera pas
une autre fille; tu périras dans la misère, et ma plus grande douleur sera
de ne pouvoir te secourir. O ma mère! ne vends point ta fille unique.

Prières infructueuses! Elle fut vendue, chargée de fers, conduite sur le
vaisseau; et elle quitta pour jamais la chère et douce patrie.²⁴

We may well ask whether Parny, in this *Chanson*, was not so carried away by the sentimentality of the situation that he quite overlooked its very essence. Of the many evils of slavery perhaps none was more repugnant than the selling of children by their parents.

A clearer perception of the viciousness of slavery is found in *Chanson V*, which warns the Negro in sombre terms of the white man's perfidy:

Méfiez-vous des blancs, habitants du rivage. Du tems de nos pères, des
blancs descendirent dans cette île; on leur dit: Voilà des terres; que vos
femmes les cultivent. Soyez justes, soyez bons, et devenez nos frères.

Les blancs promirent, et cependant ils faisaient des retranchemens. Un
fort menaçant s'éleva; le tonnerre fut renfermé dans des bouches d'airain;
leurs prêtres voulurent nous donner un Dieu que nous ne connaissons pas;
ils parlèrent enfin d'obéissance et d'esclavage: plutôt la mort! Le carnage
fut long et terrible; mais, malgré la foudre qu'ils vomissaient, et qui
écrasait des armées entières, ils furent tous exterminés. Méfiez-vous des
blancs. etc.²⁵

²² Chateaubriand, *Les Natchez*, ed. Gilbert Chinard, Baltimore, 1932, p. 398n.

²³ *Ibid.*

²⁴ *Op. cit.*, II, 69.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 64. On the strength of Chateaubriand's interest in the *Chansons madécasses*, a resemblance between *Chanson IX* and the medicine man's speech before the Indian council in *Les Natchez* (*op. cit.*, p. 421) might be suggested.

This constant preoccupation with the miseries of an unfortunate race, supported by the foregoing observations, upholds the opinion of Parny's friend and biographer, Tissot, that the poet was "sensible partout aux malheurs de l'humanité."²⁶ It seems pertinent, therefore, to suggest a serious qualification of the idea that in eighteenth-century French poetry "aucune œuvre [excepting Voltaire's] ne compte dans l'histoire de la pensée."²⁷

EDWARD D. SEEBER

The Johns Hopkins University

AN UNPUBLISHED FRAGMENT OF GUI DE CAMBRAI'S
VENGEMENT ALIXANDRE

In the Bodleian Library's *Summary Catalogue of Western Manuscripts*, vol. 6, part 1, no. 31363, is listed a fragment of Gui de Cambrai's *Vengement Alixandre*, consisting of two leaves which correspond to ll. 281-482 and 959-1155 of my edition of the poem.¹ The fragment is on parchment and, according to the catalogue, was written about 1300. It is now listed as MS Fr. b. 1. In 1891 the two leaves formed part of a volume, listed in the catalogue as no. 31346, which contained manuscript documents chiefly of historical interest. This volume had formed part of the Lakelands Library,² and passed into the Bodleian collection through the intermediary of Mr. B. Quaritch.

To Mr. E. B. Ham, who first called my attention to the fragment, I am also indebted for a photostatic copy of the four pages, a careful transcript of the manuscript, whose bad condition necessitated the use of the ultra-violet lamp to establish several readings, and a discussion of the fragment's place in the manuscript tradition, to which I need add only additional corroborative material.

²⁶ *Œuvres complètes de Parny*, Bruxelles, 1834, I, 24.

²⁷ Lanson, *op. cit.*, p. 644.

¹ *Elliott Monographs*, no. 23.

² The library of W. H. Crawford of Lakelands, Co. Cork, which was sold at auction in 1891 by Sotheby, Wilkinson and Hodge, of London. In their catalogue the volume is listed under the number 695, "Chartae Anglo-Saxonicae et Latinae," but there is no mention of the *Vengement* fragment.

According to Mr. Ham the two leaves of the fragment measure 382 x 275 millimetres. There are two columns to the page, of 50 lines each, written in a careful hand. Since we may count 200 lines to a leaf, and since in G, the manuscript most closely resembling the fragment, there are 407 lines intervening between lines 483 and 958, it is evident that two leaves, presumably the middle folio of a signature, are missing between the two parts of our fragment. The same manuscript G has 270 lines up to the start of the first fragment. This fact suggests that, if the fragment had a similar number of lines, the *Vengement* was not the sole portion of the *Roman d'Alexandre* which it contained, for it would be unusual for a work to start on the verso of a leaf. It is certain that the fragment did not form a part of any of the extant manuscripts of the *Roman d'Alexandre*, since the number of lines to a column is greater than in any manuscript which does not at present contain the continuation either of Gui de Cambrai or of Jehan le Nevelon. It does not seem unlikely that the fragment may be a remnant of a complete and—to judge from what is preserved—carefully executed copy of the *Roman d'Alexandre*.

As far as we may judge, the fragment in its language is the product of a scribe who used the common orthography of his time but allowed a restricted number of Picard peculiarities to colour his writing. The picardisms are in general restricted to the writings *ch* before *e* and *i*: *che*, *chele*, *cheste*, etc., but also *ce*; and *c* before *a*: *camp*, *castel*, etc., but also *champ*, *chastel*, etc. There are two cases of the reduction of *-iee* to *-ie*: *drecies* (345), *enforchie* (1099). Both *fremê*, *fretê*, and *fermê*, *fertê* are found. *Vo* and *vos* occur, as also *aus* < *illos*, *aront*, *merrez*, etc. The glide consonant is found in *tindrent*, *ensamble*, *membre*, although lacking in *tenrement*, *faurrons*, *vaurra*, etc. Many other dialectical characteristics are lacking or occur only sporadically. *Le* for *la* is not attested except in the dubious cases of *Egypte le grant* (960) and *quel le feron* (1015).³

Se for *sa* is found only once: *se prison* (1105); both *veïr* and *veoir* occur. Noteworthy peculiarities of the scribe are his writings *esmaulz*, *maulz*, *vault*, etc.; also *joendi*, and the use of *traïtres* as the oblique plural (431, 1033, 1092).

In its manuscript relations the fragment belongs to the group

* *La part le plus haut* (982) is a barbarism due to a misreading.

which I have designated by the sign x' in my classification.⁴ Of these five manuscripts—GIJKL—the fragment is strikingly nearest to G. In view of this agreement with a manuscript which is generally so stable an element of its group, a complete enumeration of the concordances of the fragment with the x' -group, or with the sub-groups GIL and GL, is unnecessary. The following cases are chosen from among the most prominent.

1) The fragment as a member of the x' -group includes lines 286a, 390a, 456a, 466a, 479a, 1091a, which are in x' but not in the constituted text; omits 387-8, 1127; gives the following readings: *Qui Caldee conquist* (455), *Aristotes li maistres i sermonne les gens* (471), *fors du bus departir* (1003), *Mais Perdicas l'encauche* (1010), *comme chevaliers bons* (1086).

2) The fragment as a member of the GIL-group includes line 1093a; omits 402, 420, 1002; gives the following readings: *et quar vous en hastez* (437), *Il chevauche a grant forche* (1094).

3) The fragment as a member of the GL-group omits lines 298, 375; gives the following reading: *ains que vous en partez* (1102).

4) The fragment in its connection with G omits line 332; inverts lines 301-2, 1024-5; gives the following readings: *et ojs* (289), *a tant s'en sont torné* (301), *Qui fu ja cheste vile* (394), *et il soient armez* (449), *se sont rehaitié* (1032), *fait son apareillement* (1050), *A chu mot esperonne* (1111), *A terre l'ont porté* (1142).

The fairly numerous individual readings of the fragment are proof that it could not have been the direct source of G. It gives *Lascre* (327) and *Yas* (1048) for *Jasle* as in G, and departs from the readings of all other manuscripts in such cases as *est moult chascuns pensis* (287), *de grant gent si poissant* (407), *par dedens ce chalant* (417), *En Babilone* (470), *Au retraire* (974), *en la part le plus haut* (982), *Son escu li fendi* (983), *s'il l'abat ne m'en chaut* (984), *En mi lieu de l'estour* (1145).

It is also improbable that G served as direct source of the fragment, since in 1054 the fragment has preserved the reading of the x' -group while G has an individual variation: fragment and IJKL *et si home ensement*, G *o son efforcement*. Other less conclusive cases may be found in the following readings: *Por l'amour sa serour qui avoit non Biblis* (286a), *lez le port de Gangis* (291), *La gerre estoit commune et li jors biaz et caus* (1067). In line 1098 the possible contamination of G from the x' -group is not echoed in the fragment, which reads with IKL.

⁴ Elliott Monographs, no. 20.

Lines 1070-2 are omitted by GL but present in the fragment. Since both 1069 and 1072 commence with the word *Agolans*, the omission in GL may be due not to the absence of the lines in the original of the group but to individual carelessness. In any case the fragment gives no other indication of familiarity with more than one source.

The importance of the fragment for the establishment of the text is not great. It comports itself as a normal member of its group and sub-groups, and offers no particular problems nor solves any. It is interesting, but not overly significant, that in lines 308 and 424 the fragment has readings in common with H alone; these readings I have preserved in my text against the testimony of the other manuscripts.

BATEMAN EDWARDS

Princeton University

PLAYERS' QUARTOS AND DUODECIMOS OF *HAMLET*

Between 1676 and 1718 *Hamlet* was printed in quarto at least seven times. It is the version commonly known as Betterton's, for it gives the text of the play as Betterton acted it and is accompanied by a cast in which his name appears in the title rôle. The version is built on the foundation of the 1637 quarto but this has been corrected, reformed and cut. By "corrected" I mean that someone has made an effort to get rid of compositors' errors and to present the play more nearly in Shakespeare's language. But by "reformed" I mean that this corrector has felt at liberty to "improve" Shakespeare's diction where to him objectionable or uncouth words or too violent metaphors were used. These two things are not inconsistent. These changes have been investigated by Mr. Hazelton Spencer in his *Shakespeare Improved*. The cuts made use of by Betterton are indicated in his Quarto by enclosing all lines omitted by the actors in single quotes.

Mr. Spencer gives forcible reasons for his opinion, based on internal evidence, that Sir William Davenant is the person responsible for this version. This increases our interest in it, for although we must discount and regret the "reformation" of the text, yet there are instructive corrections in the edition to which Davenant's name gives weight.

About the year 1710 the separate publication in quarto of the plays of Shakespeare for acting purposes and for sale at the theater doors came to an end, and thereafter their place was taken by little stitched duodecimo volumes. Apparently the stock of *Hamlet* quartos lasted until 1718 when there appeared in duodecimo what we know as Wilks' version of *Hamlet*, for it was prepared for Robert Wilks who had succeeded Betterton in the part of Hamlet and is accompanied by a cast which includes his name. This version was prepared for Wilks by the poet John Hughes and is the version constantly referred to by Theobald in his *Shakespeare Restored* as "Mr. Hughes' *Hamlet*." It was the stage version current in London from 1718 to 1763, when it was succeeded by Garrick's first version. During this long interval it was printed no less than nineteen times.

John Hughes in preparing this version felt constrained to retain some of the unfortunate changes which had been foisted into the text of the Betterton version. Apparently they suited the taste of the times. Sometimes they made the meter more regular. The audience was accustomed to hearing the play in these words and he therefore, no doubt with regret, suffered some of these excrescences to remain. But in a large number of instances he restored the text of Shakespeare and produced a much better version than Betterton's and one which had the entire approval of so exacting a textual critic as Lewis Theobald. In this version as in the Bettertonian *Hamlet*, the actors' cuts are indicated on the margin of the verse, but the cuts used by Wilks are occasionally different from those used by Betterton.

Such has been the disrepute of these stage versions among those seriously interested in the textual criticism of Shakespeare that no very complete study seems ever to have been made of the successive reprints of these two texts. It has been supposed, and it is nearly true, that the reprints of these texts are the same as their first printing except for accumulating compositors' errors or proof-readers' corrections or miscorrections. There is, however, one printing of the Bettertonian quarto dated 1683 which is in a class by itself, and there is also a duodecimo printing for stage purposes in 1743 of Shakespeare's *Hamlet* by Lewis Theobald, in which he has similarly marked the actors' cuts, and it is to these two editions that I wish to call attention. For reasons which will appear later the second mentioned will be taken up first.

Theobald's Stage Edition of 1743

This is a rare little book. It is not mentioned in any of the bibliographies and I know of no copies except two in the Folger Shakespeare Library, where I only recently met with them.

In 1728 had appeared Pope's second edition of the plays of Shakespeare, printed in duodecimo, each play provided with a plate and a half-title so that in addition to the sale of the collected edition, separate plays could be and were stitched up and supplied at the theater in this form. On the back of the title page of *Hamlet* in this edition, at the foot of the *Dramatis Personae*, is the following:

Scene Elsinoor:

This story was not invented by our author;
though from whence he took it, I know not.

This was an extraordinary confession of ignorance coming from Alexander Pope.

On March 14, 1729/30, Lewis Theobald in a letter to Warburton comments on Pope's ignorance as thus displayed and adds, "The story is extracted from Saxo Grammaticus' *Danica Historia*," and he gives the story in detail (Nichols III., II, 557); so when Theobald came to publish his own edition of Shakespeare in 1733 he inserted (VII, 225) at the beginning of *Hamlet* a note in which he says, "The story is taken from Saxo Grammaticus in his Danish History." Theobald's Shakespeare was reprinted in 1740 in small duodecimo form, the text as in the original edition but with the notes much condensed. Unfortunately Theobald's note as to the source of the Hamlet story was omitted, perhaps by mistake, for he had reason to be proud of his first publication of this fact.

This brings us to the year 1743, in which the supply of the stage version in duodecimo was quickly exhausted by reason of the extraordinary popularity of Garrick's *Hamlet* which had first appeared at Drury Lane on November 16, 1742, with Garrick as Hamlet, Mrs. Pritchard as the Queen, Kitty Clive as Ophelia, and Macklin as the First Grave Digger. What a cast! No wonder that the public flocked to these performances and that the supply of the book of the play ran out. Lewis Theobald was now ill and in great poverty. He died September 18, 1744. He seems to have induced a printer to reprint the play of *Hamlet* from his own edi-

tion in duodecimo without any notes but with the stage cuts marked in the margin as had so long been customary in the printing of the stage versions of the play. This gave a better text which, nevertheless, could be sold as a stage edition. The title page reads: "Hamlet Prince of Denmark. A Tragedy. By William Shakespear. Collated with the best Editions. London: Printed for the Company of Stationers 1743." Although Theobald in the copy he prepared for this venture struck out his notes and contented himself with marking cuts, he could not refrain from inserting a single note. At the foot of the page which carries the *Dramatis Personae*, in the exact place where Pope had exposed his ignorance as to the origin of the play, Theobald printed:

"The story taken from Saxo Grammaticus's
Danish History.

"Note—By the directions of Sir William
Davenant, Mr. Dryden and others the lines marked
thus ' are generally left out in the representation."

It is in this note, and certain inferences from it, that the value of this little edition lies. We had been afforded no assurance that either Davenant or Dryden had to do with the preparation of the stage texts of *Hamlet*, until Mr. Spencer recently advanced with persuasive reasoning the conjecture that Davenant was responsible for the Bettertonian text. I think it may fairly be said that this note by Lewis Theobald advances that conjecture almost to the point of certitude. It is refreshing to find the conjectures of Shakespearean students thus unexpectedly verified.

But what had Dryden to do with the text of *Hamlet*? I will here venture another conjecture which I hope may some day be as completely verified as that concerning Sir William Davenant. Sir William died in 1668. He was the manager or proprietor of the Duke's Company, of which Thomas Betterton was the principal actor. It is, I think, not to be doubted that he consulted with Betterton as to what cuts were proper to be marked, and that in this way the prompt copy for the Duke's Theater was prepared, although it was first printed in 1676, eight years after Davenant's death.

The union of the companies in 1682 brought John Dryden, whose contract was with the King's Company, into closer relations with Thomas Betterton, who added to his fame by taking

the leading parts in Dryden's tragedies. We know that the two were often closely associated, and Lewis Theobald in the note previously quoted indicates that Dryden also had some part in the Bettertonian *Hamlet*.

The Bettertonian Text of 1683

In 1683 was printed in quarto: "The Tragedy of Hamlet Prince of Denmark. As it is now Acted at his Highness the Duke of York's Theatre. By William Shakespeare. London: Printed for H. Herringman and R. Bentley, at the Blew Anchor in the New Exchange, and in Russell Street in Covent garden. 1683."

This seems to have been printed by the same printer as the preceding quarto, which it very much resembles in outward appearance. But collation of the two texts shows that the 1683 quarto is not a mere reprint of that of 1676. The printer has had before him a copy of the 1676 quarto in which someone has entered a number of corrections taken from a first folio of Shakespeare. The selection exercised by the corrector is notable. He did not disturb what I have previously called the "reformed" passages, but he knew that the stage text had come down from the old quarto and he knew that there are places where a better reading is supplied by the folio text. And of the three folios which he might have consulted he chose the first. A longer list of these corrections might be given. The following is a representative selection.

	<i>Q readings carried into Q 1676 and continued Q 1695 and Q 1703</i>	<i>F¹ readings brought into Q 1683</i>
I, I, 63	sleaded Pollax	sledded Poll-ax
I, II, 77	cloke could smother	Cloke (good Mother)
I, III, 76	love oft loses	Lone oft loses
I, V, 55	So but though to a radiant angle	So lust though to a radiant Angel
II, II, 465	affection	affectation
II, II, 473	'tis not it	'tis not so; it
II, II, 496	falls.	falls. Then senseless Illium
II, II, 525	mobled	innobled
II, II, 580	wand	warm'd

III, II, 288	with provincial	with two Provincial
III, III, 22	boistrous rain	boistrous Ruin
III, III, 58	shew by justice	shove by Justice
IV, VII, 85	they can well	they ran well
IV, VII, 172	our culcold maids	our cold maids
IV, VII, 178	old lauds	old tunes
V, I, 9	be so offended	be <i>se offendendo</i>
V, I, 96	Lady worms Choples	Lady worms; Chapless
V, I, 114	(omits the line)	Is this the Fine of, &c.
V, I, 116	will vouchers	will his vouchers
V, II, 143	you are ignorant of	you are not ignorant of

The corrector was also careful to produce a text arrangement which would help the actor. In the 1676 printing of Betterton's quarto, lines 111-112 of II, ii, are printed so as to confuse Ophelia's letter with Polonius' comments. The corrector rearranged the lines and put the comments in brackets. He throughout changes "Gertrard" to "Gertrude." At II, ii, 496 he supplies a half line, and at V, i, 114 he supplies a whole line which had dropped out. The changes made I, iii, 76 and II, ii, 525 prove that the folio used was the first folio.

Who made these corrections? It might have been Betterton himself; but had this been so he would have perpetuated them in later printings of his quartos, and this he did not do. In the light of Theobald's declaration, the judgment which the corrector used, and remembering that in 1682 the King's Company for the first time acquired the right to present *Hamlet* and that in 1695 they lost it, I am strongly inclined to attribute the editorial work seen in the 1683 quarto of *Hamlet* to John Dryden. This will repay examination, and future critics preparing texts of *Hamlet*, and faced with the often difficult choice between the quarto and the folio reading, may find assistance in knowing what was John Dryden's choice in this matter.

As has already been stated, Betterton's quarto was printed a number of times. Two different printings occur both of which are dated 1676. Under date of 1695 there are two different title pages but the printing is the same. Under date of 1703 there are three distinct printings. The first is the so-called "Bornardo" edition; the other two read "Barnardo." Although these three printings all bear the same year date, I think this is because when reprinting was needed someone handed the book to the printer only

instructing him to print it over again, and the printer obeyed his instructions literally even as to imprint and date, notwithstanding that a later date would have been in order. I have observed this phenomenon in other quarto editions, and suspect that the three quartos dated 1703 should be assigned to successive dates to fill up the gap until Wilks' *Hamlet* appeared in 1718.

But none of these later Betterton quartos follow any of the corrections of 1683. They are successive reprintings of the original quarto of 1676. The reason for this may be that Dryden's revision was looked upon as the property of the King's Theater in Drury Lane, and so when the Players, headed by Betterton, seceded in 1695 and set up a second house in Lincoln's Inn Fields they were compelled to reprint their book from the old prompt copy which they had used before the union. At any rate they did so, and Dryden's changes have never appeared in any other text.

Those interested in the stage history of *Hamlet* may be glad to have their attention drawn to the fact that in the Folger Library, in addition to two other copies of this 1683 quarto of *Hamlet*, there is a third copy, formerly the property of Mr. Halliwell-Phillips, in which he has noted on the the fly leaf "A curious old prompt copy." It is worth careful study by someone. It shows further cuts and some manuscript additions entered in a 17th century hand. For example:

"caviary to the general" is changed to "caviary to the multitude"

"we'll hear a play" to "we'll have a play"

"wezel" becomes "ousel"

"pace of practice" becomes "pass of practice"

And as showing that in Betterton's time the Ghost in the closet scene came up through the floor there occurs the entry at the proper place "Ghost at great trap" and later "Ring Ghost up." This has every appearance of being the prompt book for *Hamlet* of the King's Company during the years 1682-95, when they had the right to present this play.

HENRY N. PAUL

Philadelphia

ERRORS AND OMISSIONS IN THE GRIGGS FACSIMILE OF THE SECOND QUARTO OF *HAMLET*

Shakespearian scholars today pretty generally agree that the Second Quarto of *Hamlet* (1604) presents, in spite of numerous misprints and some omissions, the text of Shakespeare's masterpiece as Shakespeare wrote it, "according to the true and perfect Coppie." Specimens of this edition are excessively rare. Miss Bartlett (*A Census of Shakespeare's Plays in Quarto*, 1916) lists only three, all at present in the United States: one in the Huntington Library, one in the Folger collection, now in the Folger Shakespeare Library at Washington, and one in the Elizabethan Club at Yale University. I shall hereafter designate these copies by the symbols H., F., and E. C. respectively.

Scholars unable to consult any of these copies at first hand have been forced to rely on the Griggs facsimile in photo-lithography, published in 1880 under the supervision of Dr. Furnivall. This facsimile was made from the Duke of Devonshire's copy of Q2, i. e. the copy now in the Huntington Library. As Furnivall noted in his Forewords, this copy like the other Kemble Quartos in the Duke's collection had its pages cut down and mounted, "which accounts for the loss of some headlines, catch-words and signatures." Fortunately, however, the text itself remains unimpaired. Viator's useful reprint of the parallel texts of *Hamlet* (Q1, Q2, and F, 1891, revised edition 1913) is based for the Q2 text on Griggs' facsimile and has therefore no independent value; it reproduces the errors of the facsimile and adds, in both editions, some of its own.

It has been my good fortune, by the generosity of the Huntington and Folger Libraries and the Elizabethan Club, to obtain recently photo-static reproductions of the three copies of Q2 now in this country. I have submitted these to a careful collation with each other and with the facsimile, and have found that with two exceptions, to be hereafter noted, the photo-stats agree with each other in every case, even in the smallest details of punctuation. There are no variants due to proof correction while the book was passing through the press such as one often finds in Elizabethan quartos, notably in the first quarto of *Lear*. On the other hand, the Griggs facsimile differs again and again from the text of the photo-

stats, as a rule in minor matters of punctuation, but occasionally in alteration of letters and omission of words which affect the text. I have noted all these, and for the benefit of scholars and libraries depending upon the facsimile or Viator for the true text of Q2, I subjoin here a list of these differences. I cite by the page number of the facsimile and the act, scene, and line number of the Globe edition printed in the margin of Griggs.

P. 19 (1, 4, 51). Griggs has a period after *again*. All three photo-stats have a question mark more or less broken as is often the case with the type used for this edition. The B. M. Q2 (1605) also has the question mark here.

P. 20 (1, 4, 68). Griggs *flood my*, followed by a faint mark which may represent an imperfect comma. Here Griggs reproduces H. exactly and E. C. agrees with H. F., however, contains the missing and necessary word *Lord* after *my*. The careful textual notes of the Cambridge edition (V. 7, p. 418) state that *Lord* is omitted in Q2; but the appearance of the word in F. shows that this was not the case in all copies of Q2. Moreover since this word appears in the B. M. Q2 (1605) and in all the later Qq now in the Folger Library, as I am informed by Professor Adams, it would seem that the original copy of Q2 from which these were successively set up must have been one which like F. contained the word *Lord*.

A careful examination of the photo-stats at this point goes to show that we have to do here not with a proof-reader's correction, supplying the missing word in later copies as the sheets were being struck off, but with a mere failure on the printer's part to ink his form properly. L. 68 is a very long line; the word *Lord* projects far toward the right hand margin of the page and might easily have been missed when the form was re-inked. The same cause accounts for the absence in H. and E. C. of the final *e* and the period in 1, 5, 7.—see the next note.

P. 21 (1, 5, 7). Griggs *shalt hear*, reproducing H. which here, as in the preceding case, agrees with E. C. But F. has *shalt heare*., presenting the final *e* and the period wanting in the other two photo-stats. This line is number 4 from the top of D2 verso in the Q, corresponding in position with 1, 4, 68, which is 4 from the top of D2 recto. Like the former line, the present is an unusually long one and the absence of the final *e* and the period in H. and E. C. may be ascribed to a failure in inking.

P. 28 (2, 1, 81). Here at the end of the line Griggs has a blurred point that more closely resembles a period than a comma. Viator evidently took it as a period since he reproduces it as such in both his editions. But all three photo-stats have a comma which is what the text demands.

P. 33 (2, 2, 155). Here Griggs reads *know* with no punctuation mark following. All three photo-stats show a period. It is perhaps plainer in E. C. than in the others, but unmistakable in all.

P. 36 (2, 2, 320). Here Griggs has *Aunimales*. The three photo-stats *Animales*. The *n*'s in H. are not well inked, but the first is clearly an *n*, not a *u*. In F. and E. C. the *n*'s are unmistakable.

P. 40 (2, 2, 525). Griggs has no period after *Queene* in Hamlet's repetition of the word. All three photo-stats have a period here.

(2, 2, 531). Griggs prints *ore teamed* as two words. All three photo-stats connect with a hyphen, *ore-teamed*.

P. 41 (2, 2, 595). Griggs prints *Iohn a dreames* as three words; the photo-stats connect by hyphens, *Iohn-a-dreames*.

P. 45 (3, 1, 120). Here we get the first evidence of a tampering with the text. Griggs reads *enoculat* in, I suspect, an attempt to correct a misprint and bring the Q text into agreement with the *textus receptus*—the Folio has correctly *innoculate*. All three photo-stats have *enocutat* or possibly *euocutat*; the second letter looks like an inverted *n*, but it is difficult to be certain. A strong magnifying glass put on the first *t* in the facsimile seems to show a prolongation of a faintly crossed *t* in such a way as to eliminate the cross and change the letter to an *l*. This must have been done in the plate from which the facsimile was printed. Cf. below note on 5, 2, 245.

P. 47 (3, 1, 192). The last word of this line in Griggs looks like *care*, and was so read by Viator who in his first edition prints *care*, later correcting to *eare*. In H. the loop of the *e* is closed, but a comparison of the letter with others in the adjacent lines shows that it is not a *c*. F. and E. C. show *e* a little more plainly. See note on 4, 5, 90 below.

P. 51 (3, 2, 162). The last word in this line in Griggs looks like *fing* with a defective *f*. This is probably due to a blot over the letter in H. which misled the corrector of Griggs. In both F. and E. C. the letter is plainly an *r* which is what the text demands: i. e. *ring*.

(3, 2, 171). The first letter of the third word in Griggs looks like a *t*, *tourneyes*. What is wanted is an *i*. In H. the dot over the *i* is not very clear, but perceptible with a glass. In F. and E. C. it is perfectly plain.

P. 56 (3, 2, 385). Griggs has *s'hloud*; all three photo-stats the correct *s'bloud*. The *b* in H. is so plain that it cannot be mistaken for *h*. Cf. note on 5, 1, 160 below where the same mistake appears in Griggs.

P. 67 (4, 2, 11). Griggs has no punctuation after *owne*. The necessary comma is faint but visible in H., blurred in E. C., and perfectly clear in F.

P. 70 (4, 3, 4). Griggs has no punctuation after *randeuous*. All three photo-stats have a period.

P. 72 (4, 5, 29). Griggs omits the word *Song* in the right hand margin after this line. It appears in all three photo-stats. This must be due to some tampering with the plate; below after l. 38 Griggs correctly prints *Song* in the right hand margin. Did a corrector of the plate for the facsimile imagine that Ophelia had but one song here and consequently delete one of the stage directions?

P. 73 (4, 5, 69). Griggs omits the comma after *ground* which appears in all three photo-stats.

P. 74 (4, 5, 90). Griggs reads *care* at the end of this line. All three photo-stats correctly *eare*. The first *e* in H. is rather blurred, but certainly not a *c*. Cf. note on 3, 1, 192.

P. 79 (4, 7, 43). Griggs has a period after *kingdom* at the end of this

line. The photo-stats have a comma, somewhat blurred in H., but unmistakable in the others.

(4, 7, 55). Griggs has no punctuation after *Lord*; all three photo-stats have a comma.

P. 80 (4, 7, 83). Griggs has a period after *Normandy*; all three photo-stats a comma.

P. 81 (4, 7, 106). Griggs has no punctuation after *you* at the end of this line; all three photo-stats a period, a mark often used by Elizabethan printers to indicate, as here, an interrupted or unfinished speech.

(4, 7, 120). After *change* at the end of this line Griggs leaves a space and then sets a comma thus: *change,*. This may be due to the fact that the necessary *s* is in H. crowded against the preceding letter and far from clear. It is clear enough, however, to show that the true reading is *changes*, and there can be no mistake about this word in the other two photo-stats.

(4, 7, 123). Griggs reads *thrifts*, apparently in an attempt to correct a palpable misprint. All three photo-stats read *thirfts*, although it is not always easy to say whether the fifth letter is an *f* or a long *f*.

P. 84 (5, 1, 30). Griggs prints *thefelves*, omitting the macron (˘) over the first *e*, placed there by the printer of Q2 to save the space required for the letter *m* in a crowded line. All three photo-stats have this mark.

P. 85 (5, 1, 73). Griggs omits the period after *making*; it appears in all three photo-stats.

P. 86 (5, 1, 124). Griggs omits the period after *to*; it appears in all three photo-stats.

(5, 1, 160). Griggs prints *horne*; all three photo-stats correctly *borne*. Cf. note on 3, 2, 385 above.

P. 88 (5, 1, 258). The punctuation mark after *doone* in Griggs looks like a comma. It might perhaps be mistaken for a comma in H.; but in F. and E. C. it is plainly a period.

P. 90 (5, 2, 2). Griggs has a comma after *circumstance*. H. has a blurred period that might be mistaken for a comma, but F. and E. C. have clearly a period.

P. 95 (5, 2, 216). Griggs omits the word *to* before *Laertes* in this line. It appears in all three photo-stats.

(5, 2, 245). Griggs prints *fane away*. It seems evident that the plate has been touched to turn a rather faint *t* in H. into an *f* in the facsimile. It is interesting to note that Dover Wilson in his valuable discussion of the text of *Hamlet* (Cranach Press edition, Weimar, 1930) relying on the facsimile takes *fane* to be the original reading and remarks (p. 182) that "the corrector [of the press] is able to make the easy change from the nonsensical *fane* to *tane*." It is not easy to see why the miscorrector of the facsimile should have changed *tane* to the nonsensical *fane*.

THOMAS MARC PARROTT

Princeton University

MARLOWE'S "FRENCH CROWNS"

In writing the Introduction to his new edition of *Doctor Faustus*, Professor Boas has dealt at some length with the intricate problem of the relations of the 1604 and 1616 texts. In support of his belief that the 1616 version of I, iv, is earlier than that of 1604, and that the additions to the 1604 text came from another pen than Marlowe's, he adduces a piece of evidence which it is the purpose of this paper to question.¹ Commenting on the Clown's use of the words "French crowns . . . English counters," Boas remarks:

Ward quotes from Harrison, *Description of England*, II, 25: "Of forren coines we have . . . finallie the French and Flemish crownes, onlie currant among vs, so long as they hold weight." Ward also points out (Introd., p. cxxxiv, note) that in 1595 England began to export largely to France, and that this commerce, together with the reimbursement of the large sums which Elizabeth had lent to Henry IV, drew a large quantity of French money to England. Hence the passage is almost certainly an interpolation after Marlowe's death.

Ward, it appears, obtained the information which Boas borrowed, from still another source. He cites the possibility that the 1604 text contains the play as it was performed from 1597 onwards "with the additions by Dekker," and the edition of 1616 "the play as it was performed from 1602 onwards with the additions by Birde and S. Rowley." In a note to this passage Ward says:

This supposition is rendered probable by the fact that a passage printed in the quartos of 1604 and 1609 is omitted in that of 1616; which passage, as has been acutely pointed out by Dr. Albers, *u. s.*, 380, seems like an addition of 1597. It is the Clown's contemptuous comparison of the value of French crowns to that of English counters (iv, 36-37). 'In the year 1595 an active and considerable commerce arose between England and France. England commenced to export a large quantity 'd'objets de première nécessité' to France, and this commerce together with the reimbursement of the large sums which Queen Elizabeth had lent to Henry IV, drew a large quantity of French money to England; but this was not the case in the days of Marlowe, and the allusion in question in his days would have been rather incomprehensible.'²

¹ *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*, edited by Frederick S. Boas, New York, 1932, Introduction, pp. 23-24 and p. 27.

² A. W. Ward, *Old English Drama*, Oxford, 1878. Introd., pp. lxxxv-lxxxvi.

It was, then, Albers who first used this passage as a test of Marlowe's authorship. He cites it as the "main reason" why he does not "hold Marlowe responsible" for the passage, and rests his case upon the condition of French finances at the time.³ But the point at issue here is not whether the French money circulating in France was debased (as it no doubt was); nor is it whether there was an increased circulation of French crowns in England in 1595. The only important question is whether Christopher Marlowe's audience in 1593 or earlier would have understood clearly the Clown's reluctance to accept the money offered him (a trait rare enough in an Elizabethan clown) and would have laughed when he compared the French crowns to worthless slugs.

It is hardly necessary to point out that Shakespeare has, among a number of references to French crowns, two that should have given some pause to those who reached the conclusions just mentioned. They are *Midsummer-Night's Dream*, I, ii, 92, and *Love's Labour's Lost*, III, i, 148. If we must date Marlowe's passage after 1595, we must also date these two plays later.

However that may be, it appears that the name French crown was familiar not only to the theatre-goers of Marlowe's day (some of whom probably had very good reason for regretting that fact) but also to Marlowe himself. An expert on English coinage is authority for the fact that the circulation of French money in England dates from the time of the English conquests there.⁴ A glance at the *Statutes at Large* and the proclamations issued by the Crown from time to time demonstrates that the chief difficulties which the English government had to meet in effecting the desired standards of weight and fineness in its money, were connected with the circulation of foreign gold within the realm. This coin, even more so than the English coin, was counterfeited both at home and abroad; it was circulated freely and used to fleece the unwary or the ignorant. A law of 1554 gives a fairly good picture of the situation:

Forasmuch as by the Laws of this Realm small and no due and condign

³ J. H. Albers, "On Christopher Marlowe's 'Tragical History of Doctor Faustus'", *Jahrbuch für romanische und englische Sprache und Literatur*, N.F., III, 379-380.

⁴ Rev. Rogers Ruding, *Annals of the Coinage of Britain*, 3 vols., London, 1817, I, 192.

Punishment is at this present Time provided for such evil disposed Persons as shall counterfeit or forge such kind of Gold or Silver of other Realms, as is not the proper Coin of this Realm, and yet permitted and suffered by the Queen Our Sovereign Lady's Consent, and heretofore hath been permitted and suffered by the Consent of her Most Noble Progenitors, to be currant in Payment within this her Realm, nor for such Persons as shall counterfeit the Queen's Highness Sign Manual, or Privy Signet or Privy Seal; by reason whereof divers evil disposed Persons are encouraged and boldned daily to perpetrate and commit the said several Offences

II For Remedy whereof, be it enacted by our said Sovereign Lady the Queen, the Lords Spiritual and Temporal, and the Commons, in this present Parliament assembled, and by the Authority of the same, That if any Person or Persons hereafter falsely forge and counterfeit any such Kind of Coin of Gold or Silver as is not the proper Coin of this Realm, and is or shall be currant within this Realm by the consent of the Queen, her Heirs or Successors: (2) or if any Person or Persons at any Time hereafter do falsely forge or counterfeit the Queen's Sign Manual, Privy Signet or Privy Seal; (3) that then every such Offence shall be deemed and judged High Treason. (4) And the offenders therein, their Counsellors, Procurors, Aiders and Abettors, being convict according to the laws of this Realm of any of the said Offences, shall likewise be deemed and adjudged Traitors against the Queen, her Heirs and Successors, and the Realm, and shall suffer and have such Pains of Death, Forfeiture of Lands, Goods and Chattels, and also lose the Privilege of all Sanctuary, as in the case of High Treason is used and ordained.⁶

Similar laws providing punishment for counterfeiters are scattered throughout the statutes of the sixteenth century. They are directed not only against counterfeiters of British money but also against the debasers and counterfeiters of foreign money, whether the latter was current within the kingdom or not.⁶ The French crown was one of the foreign coins current in England. As early as May 25, 1522, the "crown soleil" (French crown) was given a current value of 4s. 4d.⁷ A proclamation dated March 8, 1554 allowed "French crowns of the sun to pass at 6s. 4d."⁸ It also stated that when such coins were of standard fineness they might be paid in or out of the Exchequer. A proclamation of October 9, 1560, determined that "the gold Burgundian, Kaisars, or French

⁶ 1 Mary, Sess. ii, Ch. vi.

⁷ See, for example, 1 and 2 Phillip and Mary, Ch. xi; 4 Elizabeth, Ch. iii; and 18 Elizabeth, Ch. i.

⁸ *Tudor and Stuart Proclamations*, calendared by Robert Steele, Oxford, 1910, No. 82.

⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 448.

Crowns hitherto current at 6s. 4d." were to be current at 6s., and "the gold Pistolettes valued at 6s. 2d." were to be current at 5s. 10d.⁹ Very soon after this, March 13, 1561/2, the value of French and Burgundian crowns was reduced from 6s. to 4s.¹⁰ This fact is good evidence that the vast majority of French crowns circulating in England at that time were inferior, since such reductions in value were made in order to compensate for debasement.¹¹ However, a more significant circumstance is made known by a proclamation of November 15, 1561, which contained cuts of six coins, including a French crown.¹² This was done so that the general public might, when the proclamation was posted, have ample opportunity to familiarize itself with the appearance of the genuine coin, and thus to arm itself against deception by spurious imitations. In the year 1587 (October 12)

a Proclamation was issued, for reforming the deceits in diminishing the value of Coins of Gold current within the Queen's Majesty's Dominions, and for remedying the losses that might grow by receiving thereof, being diminished. From which it appears that English Gold Coins, and also foreign Money current in the Realm were exported into foreign countries, and there diminished; and that it was afterwards returned, and paid in lieu of lawful Money. Others of them were embased, by clipping, sawthering, or other unlawful practices, of their due fineness; and many were counterfeited abroad.¹³

The same proclamation provided that "all persons to whom such Coins should be offered, were authorized not only to refuse them, but also to strike a hole at their pleasure in every such piece. . . ." ¹⁴ Of this latter authorization Marlowe's clown does not seem to have availed himself, unless he wishes to imply, by referring to the *guilders* as *gridirons*, that they are already struck through. Finally, it may be noted that the French crown was one of the coins referred to above by Ruding as "foreign Money," for it was included in the list of abatements for that year.¹⁵

With these things in mind it is hard to think that Marlowe's audience would have failed to get the Clown's point in referring to French crowns as being of no more value than English counters. It is not difficult to believe, on the other hand, that there were

⁹ *Ibid.*, No. 530.

¹⁰ *Ibid.*, No. 559.

¹¹ Ruding, *op. cit.*, II, 135.

¹² *Ibid.*, No. 556.

¹³ Ruding, *op. cit.*, II, 171-2.

¹⁴ Ruding, *ibid.*, II, 172.

¹⁵ Ruding, *ibid.*, II, 173.

many in the audience who had been so unwise as to accept just such French crowns as the fool pretended to reject. And especially would this be true of those in the pit, from which the unlearned gaped up at the actors, and for whose entertainment in particular these lines were written.

Moreover, there is also reason to believe that Marlowe himself had in mind when he wrote these lines something more serious and important than the playful quip of the Clown, for if there is any truth in what the infamous Richard Baines had to bequeath to posterity, the dramatist had boasted

That he had as good Right to Coine as the Queen of England, and that he was acquainted with one Poole a prisoner in Newgate who hath greate Skill in mixture of mettals and hauing learned some thinges of him he ment through help of a Cunninge stamp maker to Coin french Crownes pistoletes and English shillings.¹⁸

H. EDWARD CAIN

Catholic University of America

A SOURCE FOR *CAMBISES*

The popularity of Thomas Preston's *Cambises* as a genre play has effected its inclusion in almost every anthology of pre-Shakespearean drama and its mention in every treatise on the Elizabethan stage. Apparently, however, its source has never been noticed, and this undoubtedly accounts for the tendency on the part of some commentators to attribute some of the scenes of violence in the play to the state of the early sixteenth-century stage rather than to the work from which Preston took his material. Perhaps the very obviousness of the source has precluded previous commentators from mentioning it. The two main classical sources for information concerning the *gests* of Cambyses are Herodotus and Athenaeus, and both of these writers were available to men of the Renaissance. There is no evidence in *Cambises* that Preston went to Athenaeus, but all of the events that he mentions can be found in Herodotus's lengthy account of Cambyses. In

¹⁸ *The Life of Marlowe and The Tragedy of Dido Queen of Carthage*, C. F. Tucker Brooke, New York, 1930, p. 99. Professor Brooke also points out that Baines' charges were drawn up when he supposed Marlowe to be still alive. See *ibid.*, pp. 67-8.

spite of this fact, there is strong evidence in Preston's play that he did not go to this obvious source, but found his material in a contemporary historical work.

There are eight historical events in the life of Cambyses that are narrated by Preston: (1) the conviction of Sisamnes for bribetaking, his execution, the flaying of his body, and the appointment of his son, Otian, as his successor;¹ (2) Praxaspes's reproof of Cambises for drinking;² (3) Croesus's jest on the superiority of Cyrus to Cambises;³ (4) the shooting by Cambises of the son of Praxaspes;⁴ (5) the murder of Smirdis;⁵ (6) Cambises's passion for his "cosin-jarmin";⁶ (7) the conflict between the two young dogs and the lion's whelp, the Queen's interpretation of the combat, Cambises's rage, and the subsequent murder of the Queen;⁷ (8) the manner in which Cambises dies.⁸

By all appearances, Preston could have garnered all of his historical incidents from Herodotus; however, there are some striking objections to this thesis: (1) Preston as a moralist assumes that all of Cambises's deeds are the result of drink and an evil nature; Herodotus assures his readers regularly that they were the result of insanity: (2) Herodotus gives many other incidents that Preston could have used to advantage; under these circumstances, why did Preston use just these eight events?: (3) Herodotus writes that after the death of Cambyses the usurping magus completed the remaining seven months of Cambyses's eighth year;⁹ Preston writes in his prologue, "To bring to end with shame his race—two yeares he did not reign";¹⁰ (4) In Herodotus, Cambyses rises from the table and shoots Praxaspes's son; in *Cambises*, he calls for several more bumpers of wine before he commits

¹ T. Preston, "A Lamentable Tragedie of Cambises King of Percia", lines 353-474, J. M. Manly, *Specimens of Pre-Shakespearian Drama* (1897), II: Herodotus, v, 25.

² *Op. cit.*, 478-496: Herodotus, III, 34.

³ *Op. cit.*, 497-505: Herodotus, III, 34.

⁴ *Op. cit.*, 506-568: Herodotus, III, 35.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, 622-731: Herodotus, III, 30.

⁶ *Op. cit.*, 881-936: Herodotus, III, 31.

⁷ *Op. cit.*, 1020-1132: Herodotus, III, 32.

⁸ *Op. cit.*, 1159-1168: Herodotus, III, 64.

⁹ Herodotus, III, 67.

¹⁰ *Op. cit.*, 33.

the murder: (5) In Herodotus, Praxaspes is forced to compliment Cambyses after the shooting and to become the official assassin of Smirdis; in Preston's play, Praxaspes disappears after the shooting and Smirdis is slain by Cruelty and Murder: (6) In Herodotus, there are two versions of the murder of the Queen: she is slain at Cambyses's command; she is kicked to death by Cambyses; Preston selects the former method which is certainly less illustrative of Cambyses's cruelty. These objections would not seem serious if there were not a contemporary source that better suited the play formula.

To the men of the Renaissance, Cambyses was not insane but cruel. Compendiums like that of Textor¹¹ always include him among the vicious. The historians of the time, who were intent in showing the hand of God in the affairs of history, took the same point of view. Carion, the author of a handy pocket-history of the world, published in 1550, devotes five pages to the career of Cambyses and considers him not mad but bad. He pauses in his account of the career of Cambyses to make occasional preachments, as "*At tales mores non diu successum habere potuerunt. Loquitur enim Deus in scriptura. Viri sanguinum et dolosi non dimidiabunt dies suos in terra.*"¹² Carion sets the non-Herodotian temper for Preston's *Cambises*; he also provided the events. Carion gives exactly eight illustrations of the life of Cambyses and they are the same eight that Preston uses. There was no need to select from the wealth of Herodotus. Carion also provided the non-Herodotian account of the length of Cambyses reign when he wrote, "*Deum non ferre diu tyrannos. Nam non longe post mortem Cyri supra unius anni spacium vixit Cambises.*"¹³ In Preston's play *Cambises*, as has been mentioned, calls for more drink before he shoots Praxaspes's son, an incident not recorded by Herodotus; however, in Carion the deed is done "*cum maxime poteret.*"¹⁴ In Carion's account the compliment of Praxaspes is wanting and the courtier disappears after his son is murdered so that he does not participate in the slaying of Smirdis whom Cambyses "*necari clam iussit.*"¹⁵ These incidents vary from Herodotus but are common to Preston and Carion. Carion gives just

¹¹ J. R. Textor, *Officina* (1562), II, 161r.

¹² J. Carion, *Chronicorum libri tres* (Frankfort, 1550), p. 49v.

¹³ *Op cit.*, loc. cit.

¹⁴ *Op. cit.*, p. 48v.

¹⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 49r.

one account of the death of the Queen, the same account that Preston uses; he also calls her the "sororem-germanam," which is closer to Preston's "cosin-jarmin" than Herodotus's "full sister." In this connection, also, Carion writes, "*cum tamen ab hoc genere contrahendi matrimonii natura abhorreat*,"¹⁶ a trite statement, but especially interesting when read in connection with Preston's, "It is a thing that Natures course doth utterly detest."¹⁷ Finally, the peculations, trial, and punishment of Sisamnes are given special treatment by Carion in a chapter titled "*De supplicio iniqui Iudicis*."¹⁸ which is appended to his general discussion of Cambyses.

Now it is highly possible that Preston did not use Carion at all but some work from which Carion derived or some work that derived from Carion; however, this much is true; Preston like many of his fellows obviously preferred a contemporary short-cut to learning to the great classics of antiquity.

DON CAMERON ALLEN

State College of Washington

SPENSER'S SHAMEFASTNESSE, FAERIE QUEENE,
II, ix, 40-44

The account of Guyon's meeting with the personified abstraction, Shamefastnesse, has received little notice from the commentators. Todd¹ gives some interesting literary references to shamefacedness. Miss Winstanley² suggests that it represents the Aristotelian *aidós*. Mrs. Hulbert³ points out the appropriateness of the meeting of the two, since shamefacedness is an integral part of temperance. My purpose is to consider the relation to Aristotle a little more fully and then to relate Spenser's concept to the contemporary ideal.

¹⁶ *Op. cit.*, p. 49r.

¹⁷ *Op. cit.*, 910.

¹⁸ *Op. cit.*, pp. 49v-50r.

¹ iv, 70; v, 421. These references may be considered supplementary to those given below.

² Ed. Bk. II, Cambridge, 1924, p. lxvi.

³ *SP.*, April, 1931.

When Sir Guyon comes to the Castle of Alma he is entertained by a lady

That was right faire, and modest of demaine,
But that too oft she chaung'd her native hew.

She kept her eyes on the ground while they "commoned" and blushed continually.

Great wonder had the knight, to see the mayd
So straungely passioned.

He inquired if he had been too bold or if she was troubled by some other cause.

She answerd nought, but more abasht for shame,
Held downe her head, the whiles her louely face
The flashing bloud with blushing did inflame,
And the strong passion mard her modest grace.

Finally Alma explains to him:

She is the fountaine of your modestie:
You shamefast are, but *Shamefastnesse* it self is shee.

In Bk. iv, x, 50, the character appears again and is described in much the same manner. She is placed next to *Womanhood* in the Temple of Venus, where with eyes cast down she sat,

Ne euer durst her eyes from ground vpreare,
Ne euer once did looke up from her desse,
As if some blame of euill she did feare. . . .

One of the other figures in the group is "*sober Modestie*."

The following points should be noted in Spenser's concept: first, he characterizes *Shamefastnesse* as moved by strong *passion*: she is so "straungely passioned" that Guyon is amazed; second, this passion represents an *extreme state*: it mars her "modest grace" and is definitely a fault; third, it is somewhat distinguished from modesty; fourth, it is the result of the fear of "some blame of evil"; finally, it has a general connection with the knight of temperance before he undertakes his last adventure against the forces of sensuality, or incontinence. Its place in the Temple of Venus also implies a connection with sex.

Miss Winstanley has pointed out a general parallel between Spenser's *Shamefastnesse* and Aristotle's *αἰδώς*; but she hardly gets

beyond the fact that they both mean bashfulness.⁴ A fuller analysis of Aristotle's concept shows certain fundamental differences. The following points should be compared to the above analysis: first, Aristotle says that it is a passion (*πάθος*) (ii, 7.), a bodily condition said to be characteristic rather of a state of feeling than of a state of character (iv, 9.); second, it is a *mean state* between the extremes of shamelessness (*ἀναισχυντία*) and of consternation or utter confusion (*κατάπλησις*); third, he does not appear to make any clear-cut distinctions between modesty and shamefacedness;⁵ fourth, it is defined as a kind of fear of dishonor, but he emphasizes the fact that the sense of shame is not characteristic of a good man because it results from bad actions: it is to be considered good only conditionally, if a good man errs he will feel shame; finally, though he discusses it in the sections devoted to what practically amounts to continence, he does not link the two but leaves it simply as the general fear of dishonor.

The second and third points seem to be the main difference between the two concepts. As the third depends on the second it is not necessary to consider it here. Spenser's idea of modesty is similar to Aristotle's shamefacedness but his concept of shamefacedness itself represents one of the Aristotelian *extremes*. The personified abstraction is overwhelmed with shame from the very beginning. Her confusion mars her modesty. Her actions are not temperate; her feelings run away with her. Everywhere else in this book Spenser emphasizes the mean and the rule of reason over the passions. Here there can be no doubt that he represents an extreme: the lady is even incapacitated from performing her courtly duties to Guyon. Aristotle begins his remarks on the subject: "There are also means in the passions and concerned with the passions."⁶ Spenser, it is clear, has conceived the passion in a

⁴ Ed. Bk. II, pp. lxxi-lxxvii. (The reference to the *Nic. Ethics* is misprinted IV, XV, for IV, IX.)

⁵ In the *Eth. Eud.* (iii, 7.) shamefacedness (*αἰδώς*) is considered the physical basis for temperance (*σωφροσύνη*). Cf. J. A. Stewart, *Notes on the Nicomachean Ethics*, I, 213. St. Thomas defines shamefacedness almost exactly as Aristotle, but he discusses modesty separately. Temperance is the moderation of the stronger passions, the concupiscence of the pleasures of touch; modesty is the moderation of the weaker passions, of matters of lesser moment. (*Summa*, Quest. 160.)

⁶ *Eth. Nic.*, ii, 7, 1108.^a (Transl. Ross, Oxford, 1925.)

fundamentally different way. He makes no attempt to portray a mean but takes the literary advantage of the extreme. As this is totally out of keeping with the principle so carefully laid down in the *Ethics* the logical conclusion seems to be that Spenser was not using Aristotle as a source.⁷

It is not necessary to look for a source for Spenser's idea, it was part of his literary and ethical inheritance.⁸ The Elizabethans seem to have made a slight distinction between modesty and shamefacedness but it was sometimes lost. There appear to have been two aspects of shamefacedness and Guyon represents them both: (1) the particular application to matters of sex which often shaded into (2) the general concept as applied to all behavior. In Stephen Hawes' *Pastime of Pleasure*, Shamefastness, the jailer in the house of Correction, guards those who have sinned by seducing women.⁹ A great many of Guyon's adventures might be considered illustrations of the following passage from Elyot's *Governour* (1531): "Shamefastness ioyned to *Appetite of generation* maketh *Continence*, which is the mean betwene *Chastitie* and *inordinate luste*."¹⁰ In December, 1596, Lady Bacon wrote to the Earl of Essex and took him to task about a rumored intrigue with one of the court ladies. She describes the lady in question as "utterly condemned as too bad, both unchaste and impudent, with, as it were, an incorrigible unshamefacedness."¹¹ Golding's translation of Hurault's *Politicke, Moral, and Martial Discourses* (1595) enumerates the "ornaments of a good woman" as "meeldness, shamefastnesse, and chastitie."¹² Elizabeth assumed the virtue along with the other "ornaments of a good woman" and used it for political purposes in her international relations. According to Camden she made it an excuse to delay the marriage negotiations with Philip of Spain:

⁷ Since Mrs. Hulbert has already shown conclusively that the virtue of temperance in Bk. II is not "as Aristotle hath devised" this conclusion might almost be expected. See *SP.*, Apr., 1931.

⁸ For further references see *NED.*, and *I Tim.* 2. 9. Also note 1 above.

⁹ Percy Society, xviii, 159.

¹⁰ Ed. Croft, London, 1883, I, 238. (A great deal of Spenser's theory of love might also be related to this idea.)

¹¹ W. B. Devereux, *Lives and Letters of the Devereux, Earls of Essex*, London, 1853, I, 406.

¹² P. 332. (In Bk. IV Spenser places *Shamefastnesse* next to *Womanhood* in the Temple of Venus, as I have already pointed out.)

Her Suitor therefore King *Philip* she putteth off by little and little, with a modest answer, and honest and maidenly shamefac'dness, but in very deed out of scruple of Conscience.¹³

Thomas Wilson, in his *Arts of Rhetoricque* (1560) used it to define modesty; "Modestie, is an honest shamefastnesse whereby we keepe a constant looke, & appeare sober in all our outward doings."¹⁴ Closer to Spenser himself is a letter written by Sir Henry Sidney to his son, Sir Philip Sidney, giving him a list of rules from which to frame his conduct. Number eleven runs:

Be modest in each assembly, and rather be rebuffed of light fellows for a maiden shamefacedness, than of your sober friends for pert boldness.¹⁵

It should be noted that most of these references come from life, not literature. They are from widely different sources, including the Spenser circle itself. Spenser probably absorbed the idea long before he heard of Aristotle. It may easily have been part of his home teaching. His conception of the passion as an extreme in itself is of a *popular* nature. Aristotle handles it with more subtlety and makes it a mean passion between two extremes. If Spenser had done the same it would have been more in keeping with the rest of Book II. Instead of that he makes Guyon's modesty the result of a touch of shamefacedness in his character. The result is the same as Aristotle's mean, but the underlying idea is entirely different.

KERBY NEILL

Baltimore

"OCCASION," *FAERIE QUEENE* II. iv. 4-5

Spenser's conception of Occasion is usually traced to classic sources. Jortin suggests Phaedrus 5. 8, the twelfth epigram of Ausonius, and the Greek *Anthology*; to these Kitchin adds Dionysius Cato's *Distichs*, No. 17. A much more immediate source is the contemporary emblem books. Spenser's interest in these books is a safe assumption, if only because of the presence of his "Epigrams" and "Sonets" in Van der Noodt's *Theatre of Voluptuous*

¹³ *History of Elizabeth*, 4th edit., 1688, p. 15.

¹⁴ Ed. Geo. H. Mair, Oxford, 1909, p. 31.

¹⁵ *Harl. Misc.*, I, 380.

Worldlings (1569). Many collections of emblems treat of Occasion, but I shall list only a few: William de la Perriere, *Theatre des Bons Engins* (Paris, 1539);¹ Giles Corrozet, *Hecatomgraphie* (Paris, 1540, Emblems 41 and 84);¹ Andrea Alciati, *Viri Clarissimi* (Augsburg, 1531, sig. [A 8 recto and verso]); Alciati, *Emblematum Libellus* (Paris, 1534, sig. B ii^v); Alciati, *Emblemata* (Lyons, 1551, sig. I 3); Alciati, *Emblemata* (Frankfort, 1583, Emblem 185—the figure of Occasion is used with variations on title-page and in the colophon); and Geoffrey Whitney, *A Choice of Emblems and Other Devices* (1586, p. 181). Green (*op. cit.*, pp. 264-5) mentions Johann David's *Occasio Arrepta Neglecta* (Antwerp, 1605), with twelve illustrative plates by Theodore Galle. The emblem books usually reprint and translate the poem from the *Anthology* and illustrate it with the figure of a young, vigorous woman with winged feet (or standing on fortune's wheel or on a ball and a dolphin). Her head is bald save for a long forelock, and in her hand she usually holds a razor. She represents the mutability of occasion in general. Spenser retains only one feature of this deity, the forelock on a bald head, intended to symbolize the elusiveness of fortune. His goddess, as Kitchin points out, is a different sort of creature. She is Occasion for Wrath, and her nature is revealed by her filthy raiment, her wrinkled age, her feeble steps, and her lameness.

The figures of Discord and Envy in the emblem books may have suggested some of the details in Spenser's description that are not found in the sources mentioned. "Invidia" in Alciati's *Emblemata* (Lyons, 1551, sig. [E 8]) is a loathsome hag with viperous tongue (cf. *F. Q.* I. iv. 30. 3 and V. xii. 30. 5-7) and pendulous breasts, who supports herself with a staff. The figure appears again in his *Emblematum Libellus* (Venice, 1546, sig. E iii^v) and in *Emblemata* (Paris, 1584, No. 71), and two others much like it are to be found in J. Baudoin's *Recueil d'Emblemes Divers* (Paris, 1638): "Discord," and "Envy" (vol. 1, pp. 279, 565). None of these creatures is lame in her "other leg." (Spenser is fond of the phrase. Impotence, one of Maleger's attendants, is lame in her "other legge," *F. Q.* II. xi. 23. 6-8; see also the references to Malbecco's "other blinked eye," III. ix. 5. 5 and 27. 6-7.) For this idea Spenser

¹ Cited by H. Green, *Shakespeare and the Emblem Writers* (London, 1870), pp. 258, 261.

may have gone to Homer's account of the "other" (=left) leg of the railing Thersites, as Upton believes. Kitchin accepts the suggestion of source, but holds that Occasion is not necessarily lame in the left leg, but merely in one leg. The illustration of *Amor virtutis* in *Q. Horati Flacci Emblemata* (published by Otho Vaenius, Antwerp, 1607; see pp. 26-7) lends weight to the belief that the lameness was in the left leg. The woman in this emblem holds a cane and supports herself on a wooden left leg. So does the woman who avenges a murder in illustration of the motto, "Culpam poena premit comes" (*loc. cit.*, pp. 180-181). From such graphic contemporary sources as these, I think, Spenser probably derived the ideas that are combined in his unclassical figure of Occasion.

JAMES G. McMANAWAY

The Johns Hopkins University

A SPENSER PARALLEL

In the *Faerie Queene* there is a verbal parallel which indicates Spenser's acquaintance with the romance *Sir Degare*. Duessa's beast is described as having

An yron brest, and backe of scaly bras,
And all embrewd in bloud, his eyes did shine as glass.
(*FQ*, I, vii, 17.)

The sixteenth-century version of *Sir Degare* says of the dragon that

His eyen were bright as any glasse,
His scales were harde as any brasse (l. 315 f.).¹

Spenser's use of the same rhyme-words makes an otherwise evident parallel convincing. It is significant that Spenser's lines are strikingly similar to the sixteenth-century version of *Sir Degare* alone, but he may have read any of the three editions of the romance printed during the century.²

GEORGE P. FAUST

Princeton University

¹ Ed. E. V. Utterson, *Select Pieces of Early English Popular Poetry*, London, 1817, Vol. II, p. 114 ff.

² For the relation of the texts and for variants, see my unpublished dissertation, *Sir Degare: A Study of the Texts and Narrative Structure*, deposited in the Library of Princeton University, 1932, pp. 29, 32, and 34.

SERMONS AND MIRACLE PLAYS

Among the MSS. of Merton College one of the most interesting is No. 248, which consists of a collection of sermons compiled, apparently about 1350, by Dr. John Sheppey, Benedictine monk, Lecturer at Oxford and Bishop of Rochester from 1352 to 1360. On the first page is recorded the following statement by Bishop Reed of Chichester, who purchased the book from Bishop Sheppey's executors and presented it to the Merton library:

Tertium volumen sermonum per dom. Joh. de Shepeia S. theol. D. monachum Roffensem et postea ibidem episcopum pro suo tempore in univers. Oxon. collectorum.

These sermons were composed by a number of preachers, several of whom are named on the margins.

The liberal interspersing of English rimes in many of these sermons in this collection suggests that they were designed for a popular audience. Some of the material included in this collection is not presented in finished form but consists rather of mere notes or outlines for sermons. The passage printed below may unquestionably be regarded as affording an example of such sermon notes:

Merton Coll. MS, 248, Fol. 166^a (Col. 1)¹

He sent fro aboue a ouercummyer mythyest
 he sent fro aboue a leche scillest
 he sent fro aboue a marchange or a byer rychest
 he sent fro aboue and toche me ²

primo dico he sent fro aboue a ouercummyer mythiest & sic consequenter *similiter* in illo sermone de rotunda tabula ibi nam querens causam a primis parentibus quare prohibuit deus ne comedent de ligno paradysi & ille respondente ne forte moriamur—Cf. Gen. 3. 5] statim dixit dyabolus:
 In thys tre [MS. ys thre] es alle hys myth
 bot þer he ley and sayd nowth ryth

¹ On the top margin some lines have been trimmed away by the binder. One can make out:

Wan we wor vnmyti he strent vs	for þe seuþe giftes of þe holy gast
Wan we wor blyþe he let vs	in sofastest of trowe

² Added on the lower margin:

and toke me wan ye fro deuel poer delyuer me
 and toke me wan ye wiþ is mytiful hande rythit me
 and toke me wan ye in to blis brow me.

ette þerof hy wil ye plydh:
and witty saltow be
god and ywel for to wyte
al so wille as he.

The reference in these lines to the "sermo de rotunda tabula" awakens lively curiosity, though in regard to this matter I can add no further information.

More important still is the possible contact with the religious drama which this passage discloses. The six lines by Diabolus are strikingly dramatic in character; indeed they read like an extract from a vernacular play on the Fall. With them we may compare first the speech of Sathanas in York V:

To ete þer-of he you defende,
I knawe it wele, þis was his skylle,
By-cause he wolde non othir kende
Thes grete vertues þat longes þer-till.
For will þou see,
Who etes the frute, of goode and ille
Shalle haue knowyng as wele as hee.

The resemblance of York to the Merton lines in the italicized phrase is much closer, it will be noted, than it is to the Vulgate: "et eritis sicut dii, scientes bonum et malum," or to *Cursor Mundi*: "Als godds suld ȝee seluen be."

The corresponding play in the Towneley cycle is not available, owing to the loss of leaves from the MS. We compare next the words of Serpens in the Hegge cycle (*Ludus Coventriae*):

Of þis Appyl yf ȝe wyl byte
Evyn as god is so xal ȝe be
Wys of Connyng *as I ȝow plyte*
lyke on to god in al degre.

The parallel between the words in italics and the phrase in Merton, "hy wil ȝe plydh" is arresting, but may perhaps be accounted for in both as a riming tag.

Finally, these lines in the Merton sermon are to be compared with the text of the second Chester play:

Eva. This tree that here in the middes is
Eate we of it, we do amisse
God said we shold dye, I-wis
and we touched that tree.

Serpens. Woman, I say: leeve not this!
 for yt shall not lose yow blisse
 ne no Ioy that is his;
 but be as wise as he.

God is coynt and wyse of wytt,
 And wottes well, when yow eate hit,
 then your eyes shalbe vnknit,
 like goddes yow shall be.

The Chester play is distinctly closer to the phrasing of the Vulgate than the lines in the Merton MS. On the other hand, the English versions show very closely related stanza-forms:

4 4 4 3 4 4 4 3
 Chester, a a a b a a a b
 4 4 4 3 4 3
 Merton, a a a b a b

In both we have three four-accent *a*-lines followed by a three-accent *b*-line. The only difference, indeed, consists in the introduction in Chester of two extra *a*-lines in the second half of the stanza. Neither of these stanza-forms is at all usual in English verse of the period, so that the resemblance between the two texts in this matter is the more significant.

The speech of Diabolus in this Merton sermon probably was not composed by the homilist but taken over from some poem already existing. It has all the appearance of being an excerpt from a longer speech. And the terseness and vigor of the lines suggest that they were taken from a play of the Fall. Nevertheless, if these lines, as seems unquestionable, were composed before 1350, they are too early to be derived from any of the surviving English cycle plays. To suppose, on the other hand, that these fragmentary lines served as a source for any of the cycle plays would be absurd.

Their interest for the historian of the drama lies rather in the suggestion which they afford that the tradition of religious plays in the vernacular existed in England at an earlier date than any which can be established on the basis of the extant cycle plays. And this conclusion is, of course, in no way improbable. However, this recognition that there were probably plays in existence earlier than any which have come down to us should have the effect of making us cautious in attempting to determine too closely the textual relationships of the cycles which are preserved.

CARLETON BROWN

New York University

TESTER: *KNIGHT'S TALE*, 2499

The combat in the lists that takes place between Palamon and Arcite in Chaucer's *Knight's Tale* is interesting and valuable by reason of the description it presents of a chivalric tournament of the fourteenth century.¹ In spite of the fairly systematic treatment accorded this passage by various editors, it seems that data for the correct interpretation of one point has not yet been brought forth. I refer to one of the verses in the opening section of Part Four where the activities and scenes in Athens on the morning of the great tournament are described:

And on the morwe, whan that day gan sprynge,	2491
Of hors and harneys noyse and claterynge	
Ther was in hostelryes al aboute;	
And to the paleys rood ther many a rout	
Of lordes upon steedes and palfreys.	2495
Ther maistow seen devisynge of harneys	
So unkouth and so riche, and wroght so weel	
Of goldsmythrye, of browdyng, and of steel;	
The sheeldes brighte, testeres, and trappures,	
Gold-hewen helmes, hauberkes, cote-armures;	2500
Lordes in parementz on hir courseres, ²	
.	

All of the technical terms in this passage relating to armor appear to have been satisfactorily explained, save for the word "testeres" ³ in verse 2499. Skeat,⁴ in his glossary, has defined the word, "headpiece," or a "steel cap." Hinckley,⁵ Mather,⁶

¹ The tournament in fourteenth century England has been briefly discussed by Robert Coltman Clephan, *The Tournament, Its Periods and Phases* (London, 1919), pp. 23-37.

² *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. F. N. Robinson (Boston, New York, etc., 1933), vv. 2491-2501, p. 48.

³ The word is spelled "testeres" in the Ellesmere, Corpus, and Lansdowne MSS.; the Hengwrt and Cambridge give "testers," and the Petworth MS., "testeers." *A Six Text Print of Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, ed. Frederick J. Furnivall, The Chaucer Society, London, 1868—.

⁴ *The Complete Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. Rev. Walter W. Skeat, 2nd edition, Oxford, 1900. Glossary in vol. VI.

⁵ Harry Barrett Hinckley, *Notes on Chaucer*, Northampton [Mass.], 1906.

⁶ *Chaucer's Prologue, The Knight's Tale, etc.*, ed. Frank Jewett Mather, Cambridge [Mass.], 1899.

Gilman,⁷ Ingraham,⁸ Pollard,⁹ and Liddell¹⁰ have likewise interpreted "testeres" as 'head-pieces,' or 'helmets.' In the recent *Cambridge Students' Chaucer*, edited by Professor F. N. Robinson, the rather puzzling explanation "headpiece (of a helmet)" is given. Notwithstanding this unanimity of opinion, the glossing of "testeres" as 'helmets' can scarcely pass unquestioned when one considers that in the next verse (v. 2500) "gold-hewen helmes" are listed. This last term could refer to nothing else than the metal tilting helmets worn by the knights while jousting, and consequently, it simply duplicates the usual interpretation given for "testeres." It would be strange if a fourteenth century courtier, who had doubtless seen more than one tournament, should resort to the use of such synonyms in describing a scene with which he was perfectly familiar. The inference is, of course, that "testeres" has not been correctly defined.

At first glance, the etymology of the word is of no assistance in finding a meaning different from the one that has been suggested. Testere,¹¹ in all probability, came from the Late Latin, *testera*, through the old French, *testiere*.¹² The Modern French form is *têtière*, while the English cognate is tester (a canopy for a bed). It is plain, then, that 'headpiece' or 'helmet' is at least a logical explanation of the Middle English term. It now remains to determine whether there was not current a fourteenth century meaning other than the rather general and definitely unsatisfactory one of 'headpieces' which Chaucer could reasonably have had in mind while writing this passage.

To judge from a quotation in Du Cange, the Late Latin *testera* had developed a specialized meaning as early as the twelfth century:

⁷ *The Poetical Works of Geoffrey Chaucer*, ed. Arthur Gilman, Boston, 1879.

⁸ *Geoffrey Chaucer's The Prologue to the Tales of Canterbury, the Knight's Tale, the Nun's Priest's Tale*, ed. Andrew Ingraham, New York, 1902.

⁹ *Chaucer's Canterbury Tales*, ed. Alfred W. Pollard, London, 1886.

¹⁰ *The Prologue to the Canterbury Tales, the Knight's Tale, the Nonnes Preestes Tale*, ed. Mark H. Liddell, New York 1929.

¹¹ James A. H. Murray, etc., *A New English Dictionary* (Oxford, 1888-1928), s. v., tester.

¹² Émile Littré, *Dictionnaire de la langue française* (Paris, 1872), s. v., têtîère.

Statuta Vercell. lib. 7. f. 170: Nullus molinarius audeat vel praesumat ducere vel duci facere per civitatem Vercellarum aliquem asinum vel aliam bestiam quadrupedem per se, nisi ducatur vel teneatur per cordam vel capistrum, vel frenum seu bretholam, vel Testeram in pena solidorum X.¹³

Thus *testera*, originally a piece of pottery, a skull, or sometimes a covering, became a sort of *frenum* or bridle. It was still a head-piece, but its special meaning was headpiece or headstall of a horse or an ass, and not necessarily the skull of a man. Another quotation cited by Du Cange¹⁴ indicates that the Old French form, *testière*, was used precisely in this same sense.

Later on, the *testière* or *têtière* acquired a still more specialized significance as may be illustrated from Viollet-le-Duc:

La *têtière* est l'habillement de tête du coursier de guerre; le chanfrein est la pièce de fer qui garantit le front, l'entredeux des yeux et les narines de la bête. Il ne paraît pas que les chevaux fussent armés avant la fin du XIII^e siècle. . . . Le musée d'artillerie de Paris possède une très-curieuse *têtière* avec son chanfrein. Cette défense est faite de feuilles de parchemin collées les unes sur les autres, et composant ainsi un carton très-résistant, prenant la forme du devant de la tête de la bête. Verticalement, est rivée une plaque d'acier qui protège le milieu. Les deux vues d'acier, en forme de coques, couvrent les yeux et sont rivées au carton, ainsi que les pièces qui garantissent les oreilles et les naseaux. . . . Cette pièce de harnais date de la fin du XIV^e siècle.¹⁵

Here, then, is a description of a piece of chivalric equipment—head-armor for the *destrier* or war-horse.

That the Middle English *testere* also had reference to the defensive equipment of the war-horse is borne out in the following passage from Caxton's *Book of the Ordre of Chyualry*:

To his hors is gyuen in his hede a testiere to sygnefye that a knyght ought to do nonne armes without reason / For lyke as the hede of an hors goth to fore the knyght / Right soo ought Reason goo to fore all that a knyght doth /¹⁶

Whether Caxton's "testiere" was a piece of armor, or merely a

¹³ Du Fresne Du Cange, *Glossarium Mediae et Infimae Latinitatis* (Parisiis, 1844-1848), s. v., *testera*.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, III, Glossaire français, s. v., *testière*.

¹⁵ Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, *Dictionnaire raisonné du mobilier français* (Paris, 1872-1875), Part 8, s. v., *chanfrein*.

¹⁶ *The Book of the Ordre of Chyualry*, tr. William Caxton, ed. T. P. Byles, EETS. 168 (London, 1926), pp. 85-86.

bridle cannot, of course, be determined with certainty. However, it seems most likely that it was the former of the two, since the bridle of the completely accoutered *destrier* would not be visible under his armor.

In the light of the above quotations, the passage in the *Knight's Tale* under scrutiny may be more clearly interpreted. By reading, for "testeres," 'head-armor for horses,' a special meaning which was certainly current in chivalric times is supplied. Moreover, the proposed reading eliminates the duplication in meaning of "testeres" and "gold-hewen helmes"—a fault which one is loath to attribute to Chaucer. Finally, this interpretation fits in very well with the following item, "trappures," which has been rightly glossed as the trappings or cloth housings¹⁷ which, merely for the sake of presenting an elegant appearance, covered the big, Flemish coursers of the mediaeval knights from head to fetlock. The nature of the description makes one more than ever sure that the poet was drawing upon actual experience. In gazing about him on just such an occasion, he might well have seen 'armor made in strange and rich fashions and well constructed of steel, of embroidery, and by the goldsmith's art, shining shields, *head-armor for horses*, trappings, golden tilting helmets, hauberks, and armorial tunics.'

ROBERT W. ACKERMAN

University of Michigan

THE DIVISION OF WORDS

"He got the requisite consent."

(*American Mercury*, xxvi, 263a.)

It is often my task to read Polish students' seminar exercises and reports, and most surely if any one of them had proffered me the above horrid example of word-division my blue pencil would have got unhesitatingly into action. Against other things too, which I noticed as I read on, with my attention to the ends of lines thus awakened: *noth-ing* (pp. 284a, 360a), *knowl-edge* (382b), *catas-trophe* (303b). I began to see that the type-setter

¹⁷ There is a discussion of trappings in Clephan, *op. cit.*, p. 109.

was not guided by the same rules as I, an Englishman, had unthinkingly assumed.

What rules? I picked up some American and English magazines and books and began to look for the differences, if any. Up to a certain point, I soon found, we are agreed. Words are divided between two vowels: *audi-ence* (*Am. Merc.* 259a), between two consonants: *inten-sive* (258a), or after a long vowel or diphthong: *na-ture* (273b), *thou-sand*; except before certain common terminations: *mak-ing* (259b), *independ-ence* (295a), *morn-ing*, *threat-ened*.

It is when we come to the short vowel followed by a single consonant that a difference of practice begins to be seen. The *significance* (280b) of *Pres-ident* (261a) and *Gov-ernment* (*passim*) struck me as it were in the *stom-ach* (374b), most painfully. Such words, I thought off-hand, should be divided before the single consonant, unless it be *r* (*inter-est*, 328b). But *Liberty*, July 1st, 1933, in the course of its 54 pages showed me 34 further examples: *prop-er-ly*, *fam-ily*, *prom-ised*, *nev-er-the-less*, *ridic-ulous*, *col-umns*, *devel-opment*, and so on. The custom was evidently to attach a single consonant to the preceding vowel, if accented. Do we do this in England? Let me look further and compare.

The London *Strand* for July 1933 soon satisfied me that we don't: in its 112 pages I could find but 4 examples of division after a single consonant, and in the first two the consonant was *r*: *char-acters* (p. 78b), *char-acteristic* (47), while in the other two the division was before a common termination: *mechanic-ally* (30b), *natur-ally* (47). On the other hand, *pro-mises* (p. 26) and *pre-cedent* (41b) and *pro-bably* (60a) went clearly against the American rule. It seemed indeed that the magazine was chary of dividing words at all where it could be avoided by a slight adjustment of the type, and in general it was found that, whereas in fifty pages of *Liberty* were 601 divided words, in fifty pages of the *Strand* were only 220: an average of between 4 and 5 per page as against 12.

Similarly, the first hundred pages of Stuart Chase's *Mexico* gave *lav-enders* (p. 3), *prob-ably* (28 &c.), *mech-anisms* (40), *decorating* (109), altogether 25 words divided after a single consonant, whereas in the first hundred pages of an English-printed book, J. C. Curry's *The Indian Police*, were but 5: *organ-ized* (p. 35), contrasting with *stabi-lize* in *Mexico* (p. 77), *peas-antry*

(41), *admin-istration* (42), *exam-ination* (57), and *gen-eral* (63); and in general, *Mexico* had 454 divided words in the course of these pages, *The Indian Police* 327.

A hundred and five years ago Noah Webster laid down certain rules for the division of syllables, which were intended rather for learners than for type-setters. "The first and principal rule in dividing syllables," he says,¹ "is not to separate letters that belong to the same syllable, except in cases of anomalous pronunciation." However, this is not of much help, since our problem is just, to which syllable does a single consonant belong? "The best division of syllables," he continues, "is that which leads the learner most easily to a just pronunciation. Thus, *hab-it*, . . . *an-i-mal*, *al-i-ment*, *pol-i-cy*, *eb-o-ny*, *des-ig-nate*, *lam-ent-a-ble*, *pref-er-a-ble*." Here we have to remark that the modern phonetic approach is totally different, and no learner is helped, whether to a "just pronunciation" or to a just spelling, by the laborious division into *lam-ent-a-ble*. What are important are the etymological elements of which a word is composed: *lament* + *-able*. "An exception to this rule occurs in such words as *vicious*, *ambition*, in which the *ci* and *ti* are pronounced like *sh*. In this case it seems preferable to divide the words thus: *vi-cious*, *ambi-tion*." These are the cases of "anomalous pronunciation" referred to above, pronunciation, that is, unphonetically represented by the spelling; and Americans and English are in agreement that *ci* or *ti* representing [ʃ] should be attached to the following syllable. Finally, "in dividing the syllables of derivative words it seems advisable to keep the original entire, unless when the division may lead to a wrong pronunciation. Thus, *act-or*, *help-er*, *op-press-or* may be considered as a better division than *ac-tor*, *hel-per*, *op-pres-sor*. But it may be eligible in many cases to deviate from this rule. Thus *op-pres-sion* seems to be more convenient both for children in learning and for printers than *op-press-ion*."

What is a syllable? "As much of a word as is uttered with the help of one vowel," said Samuel Johnson in the 18th century. "A unit of pronunciation," says the OED, "forming a word or part of a word and containing one vowel sound and often consonant(s) preceding and/or following this." And "Orthography,"

¹ *A Dictionary of the English Language*. New York, 1828. Reprinted by E. H. Barker. 2 vols. 4°. London, 1932. p. liii.

says J.² is "the art of combining letters into syllables, and syllables into words." Yet neither he nor the OED gives us rules for syllable-division. And the language contains no simple word for it. We may take our choice between *syllabication*, *syllabification* and *syllabization*; obviously the process is not so common as *spelling*.

The present-day Webster³ lays down ten elaborate rules, which, I am informed by Prof. Malone, are probably followed by most Americans. Bearing in mind the frequent distinction between vowel or consonant letters and vowel or consonant sounds, we find their essence to be that deduced in our second and third paragraphs above. Words, when necessary at the ends of lines of print, are to be divided (a) between vowel sounds, (b) between consonant sounds, or (c) before a single consonant sound; but recognizable prefixes and suffixes are to keep their entities. However, "When the preceding vowel is short and under an accent the consonant is carried back with it." What is the origin of this apparently arbitrary ruling?

It becomes clear that all Webster's counsel, old and new, is guided by the principle that the word must fall into two parts which may be easily and smoothly pronounced. Which, then, is better: *prob-able* or *pro-bable*? American type-setters have at least this point in their support when preferring the former, that when abbreviating such a word, jocularly as in "half a sec!" or lexicographically as in "Gear: prob. from ON *gervi*," or again in that "Anon." responsible for so many poems in our anthologies, we naturally attach the consonant to the preceding vowel. The present writer however would emphasize that there is actually not the slightest pause in the articulation: the division is purely visual. Hence it appears to be a matter solely of habit and custom which is preferred. He feels that he would be "led most easily to a just pronunciation" by [prɔ bəb!] rather than by [prɔb əb!], [prɔ mis] rather than by [prɔm is].

But *proj-ect* and *noth-ing* and *knowl-edge* are another matter. Where words are compounded of independent elements, whether Greek, Latin, French, or English, they should surely be divided

² *A Dictionary of the English Language . . . to which are prefixed a History of the Language and an English Grammar*, 8th ed. London, 1799. First page of the Grammar (no pagination).

³ *A New International Dictionary*. New York, 1933. p. lix.

etymologically, and the present writer cannot but regret that the *Am. Merc.* should print *econ-omists* (xxvi. 318) or *catas-trophe* (ib. 302), whereas the *Strand* goes right with *photo-grapher* (lxxxiv. 56b), *Pro-testants* (lxxxv. 608b), *extra-vagant* (lxxxv. 650a); or that *Mexico* should show *astron-omers* (p. 35), whereas *The Indian Police* has *demo-cracy* (p. 106); *Mexico an-alyzing* (108), whereas *IP decapit-ating* (230). Yet *The Indian Police* sometimes falls from grace: *des-cribed* (195), *equiv-alent* (200).

In general we may conclude that American type-setters divide words more freely and with less nicety than their English confrères—though seldom with such ruthlessness as in the example which gave rise to this discussion. (Do any of your readers defend it?) They have set up a rule, based apparently on the dictum of Webster, that a short-vowelled accented syllable must end with a consonant; and subordinated to it, etymological considerations are made of no account. Against this the present writer, even if a voice crying in the wilderness, utters his serious protest.

B. W. A. MASSEY

Poznań, Poland

AN OMISSION FROM CURME'S SYNTAX

It is strange to find omitted from so complete a treatise on English usage as Curme's *Syntax* any discussion or authorisation of a common interpretation of the past perfect: the use of this tense to express what had been going on prior to a past time and was still continuing, as in "The day I was there he had been ill a week." Curme says of the past perfect: "This form represents a past action or state as completed at or before a certain past time,"¹ and adds no secondary uses. The statement is obviously too exclusive. The author does give, however, a secondary use of the present perfect to express an action or state begun in the past and still continuing (p. 360). The past perfect is the only tense that represents in the past the parallel to this present perfect.

A number of other fairly complete English grammars omit mention of this pluperfect use. To this fact may be due the non-com-

¹ George O. Curme: *Syntax*, D. C. Heath and Co., Boston, 1931; p. 361. Quoted by permission.

mittal or slightly erroneous statements in such foreign language grammars in English as Dunn's *Portuguese Grammar* and Ramsey's *A Textbook of Modern Spanish*. Here the authors fail to state that the foreign imperfections, which are used to express the conception with which we are concerned, indicate the continuation of a past action *into* a subsequent period in the past. However, a vast majority of the reference grammars in English dealing with Latin or the modern languages point out the continuation in such cases and call for the English pluperfect to render the construction.

RONALD B. WILLIAMS

Lake Forest College

A NOTE ON THE EIGHTEENTH-CENTURY PROGRESS PIECES

This list of "progress pieces," which supplements Dr. R. H. Griffith's much longer one,¹ adds little to our knowledge of the genre except to suggest that its vogue waned more slowly than has been supposed. The more interesting items are very briefly described.

1711. El[ijah] Fenton. An Epistle to Mr. Southerne . . . , Jan. 28. 1710/II.²
[This poem contains two distinct "progress" elements: the history of English drama from Shakespeare, and the "progress" of the "Grecian Muse" through the Roman period and that of the Druids to the times of Waller and Granville.]
1726. [John Mawer.] The Progress of Language . . . , Wherein is prov'd the first Language: Occasion'd by his Majesty's . . . Encouragement of Modern Languages. [Chinese starts the "progress."]
1732. Anon. Taste and Beauty, An Epistle to the . . . Earl of Chesterfield. [Includes a "progress" of architecture from Egypt to Greece to Rome.]
1738. William Carteret. The Progress of Petitioning; in Three Epistles to Mr. Pope. *Miscellaneous Works in Verse and Prose*, 1752, 2 vols., II, 1-32. [A curious specimen as will appear from the "Advertisement" (p. 3):

Most of the Lines in these Epistles were written in the Year 1731, merely in Pursuit of an odd Thought, that accidentally produced a few of them. . . . They were all contained in a single Piece, in the

¹ "The Progress Pieces of the Eighteenth Century," *Texas Review*, v (1920), 218-33.

² Unless otherwise indicated, the piece was published at London.

Form of an Epistle to that Gentleman [Pope]. But casting my Eyes over them again, I found in them a natural *Progress of Petitioning*, rising gradually from a pretty reasonable Request to a very unreasonable one. The Title also, thus inadvertently hit on, pleas'd me well, as I did not remember ever to have seen it among the many Progresses that had been published.

Note to "Epistle the First," pp. 5-6. The three Things for which our Author petitions his Patron, are, 1st. That he would give an impartial Judgment of his Writings; 2ly. That he would recommend him to the Town; 3dly. That he would help him to a Place. Each of these Requests our Poet has made the Subject of an Epistle.]

1739. Anon. The Progress of a Female Rake, An Epistle from Libertina to Sylvia. *The Curiosity: Or, Gentleman and Lady's Library*, 2d ed., pp. 35-47.
1752. [Thomas] Hudson. The Progress of Man, In Two Epistles to a Clergyman. *Poems on Several Occasions. In Two Parts . . .*, Newcastle-on-Tyne, pp. 145-59.
1762. Anon. The Progress of Lying, A Satire.
- [1770?] [T. P. Christian.] The Progress of War; a Poem By an Officer, Norwich, n. d.
1774. [William] Richardson. The Progress of Melancholy, A Vision. *Poems, Chiefly Rural . . .*, 4 ed., Glasgow, 1781, pp. 97-119.
1775. [Samuel Jackson Pratt.] The Progress of Painting.
1776. [Richard Graves.] The Progress of Gallantry, In Three Cantos. *Euphrosyne: Or, Amusements on the Road of Life . . .*, pp. 177-90. [Love as it affects people of different ages, and how "domestic bliss" may be realized.]
1778. [William Hayley.] A Poetical Epistle to an Eminent Painter [George Romney]. [A sort of progress of painting.]
1780. [Samuel Dexter.] The Progress of Science, A Poem Delivered at Harvard College April 21, 1780, By a Junior Sophister, n. p.
1780. John Walters. The Progress of Religion, Addressed to . . . The Lord Bishop of Landaff. *Poems*, Oxford, pp. 103-06. [In Latin.]
1784. [Edward] Jerningham. The Rise and Progress of the Scandinavian Poetry, in Two Parts.
1794. John Bidlake. The Progress of Poetry, Painting, and Music. *Poems*, pp. 1-49.
1806. Mrs. Mary Robinson. The Progress of Melancholy, A Fragment. *Poetical Works*, 3 vols., I, 43-48. [A collection of motifs generally associated with melancholy rather than a true progress poem.]
1808. Martin Kedgwin Masters. The Progress of Love, Boston, Mass. [Not so much a progress piece as a didactic poem on all varieties of love—divine, carnal, virtuous—culminating in a glorious "Picture of connubial happiness."]
- [1810?] Thomas Rhodes. The Progress of Genius [and] The Progress of Envy. *Poetical Miscellanies*, Coventry, n. d., pp. 1-48, 78-82.
1818. [Joseph Broster.] The Progress of Time. *The Rivers of Aædæ and The Progress of Time, A Moral and Descriptive Poem*, Macclesfield.

1823. John Petre. *The Progress of Poetry. Trifles*, pp. 1-4. [A late example of a genuine old-fashioned progress poem.]
1838. W[illiam] B[ell] Scott. *The Progress of Mind: An Ode. Hades; or, The Transit: and The Progress of Mind, Two Poems*, pp. 31-47. [Perhaps the latest true example of this literary type. John Clare's *The Progress of Rhyme* (written c. 1830-35?) can hardly qualify.]

ROBERT A. AUBIN

Harvard University

AN EARLY PERFORMANCE OF FIELDING'S *HISTORICAL REGISTER*

The date of the first performance of Henry Fielding's *Historical Register* has never been definitely determined. Since the performance for April 11, 1737, was advertised as the ninth day of its acting,¹ it has been conjectured that the first presentation could hardly have been later than March 31.² W. Nichols³ has produced considerable evidence which suggests, however, that it was probably first acted earlier than that, possibly on Monday, March 21, 1737, as that is the date given in the published versions for the auction which Auctioneer Hen is holding (Act II). Observance of the pre-Easter theatrical holidays would also suggest a date as early as that,⁴ but proof of an actual performance at that time has been lacking.

Corroborative evidence that the *Historical Register* was being performed over a week before the end of March appears in an entry in the diary of Viscount Percival, afterwards first Earl of Egmont. On Tuesday, March 22, 1737, he recorded a visit to the theater in the Haymarket to see the *Historical Register*:

Afterwards I went to the Haymarket Playhouse to see *The Historical Register*, wrote by Mr. Fielding. It is a good satire on the times and has a good deal of wit.⁵

EMMETT L. AVERY

University of Chicago.

¹ C. W. Nichols, "Fielding Notes," *MLN*, xxxiv (1919), 221.

² Allardyce Nicoll, *A History of Early Eighteenth Century Drama* (Cambridge, 1925), p. 328, gives this as a tentative date.

³ *Op. cit.*, pp. 221-2.

⁴ *Ibid.* See also W. L. Cross, *The History of Henry Fielding* (New Haven, 1918), pp. 209-210.

⁵ *The Diary of Viscount Percival, afterwards First Earl of Egmont* (London: Historical Manuscripts Commission, 1920-1923), II, 375.

REVIEWS

Bibliographie der Troubadours. Von Dr. ALFRED PILLET, ergänzt, weitergeführt und herausgegeben von Dr. HENRY CARSTENS. Halle: Niemeyer, 1933 (*Schriften der Königsberger Gelehrten Gesellschaft, Sonderreihe, Band 3*). Pp. xlv + 518.

This long anticipated book, the "umfassendes und mühevoll-lebenswerk" of that distinguished scholar Pillet (died October 26, 1928) has at last appeared, thanks to the zeal, devotion and labor of Dr. Carstens. It more than fulfills the hopes of Provençal scholars. It is evident from the "Vorwort" that Carsten's share in it has been very considerable—nearly one-third of the whole,—while the laborious task of revision, completing the references up to the time of printing (the preface is dated October, 1931) and seeing the work through the press, has been his alone. Not many traces of the dual authorship are visible, however. The work as it stands is a distinct achievement, involving almost infinite research, meticulous accuracy, and repeated revisions. It will undoubtedly long survive as a monument of honor to both scholars concerned in preparing it.

First comes a section on "Quellen," which contains a revised list of all manuscripts with more than one song of one or more of the troubadours. It is followed by a list of those mediaeval works which contain quotations from the troubadours. Here the authors have overlooked or omitted the additional fragments from the novella *So fo el temps qu'om era gais* of Raimon Vidal discovered by Moliné y Brasés and published by him in the *Boletín de la Real Academia de Buenas Letras de Barcelona*, XII (1912), which contain some quotations not found in the edition by Cornicelius. In my opinion, too, the *Leandreide*, attributed to Leonardo Giustiniani, should have been included in this list. It dates from the first quarter of the fifteenth century and contains several quotations from the troubadours, in a debased form of Provençal. To these is appended as an "Anhang" a list of manuscripts (generally in Old French or Latin), which contain a single song or a fragment of a song, and also literary works with single quotations. These two lists will be most helpful. Probably the new edition, by Jeanroy, of the *Jeu de sainte Agnès* (*Class. fr. du moyen âge*, 68; 1931) appeared too late to be included.

The main portion of the work, which comes next, is a revised and enlarged list of the troubadours and their songs, which is destined to supplant entirely the "Verzeichniss" of Bartsch, in his *Grundriss z. Gesch. d. prov. Litt.* (Elberfeld, 1872), so long the

vademecum of all Provençal scholars. This new list contains far more than Bartsch attempted to give. It contains: a, references to all that has been written on the subject of the particular troubadour listed under the number, and the editions, if such exist, of his works; b, references to the *Vida*, if found; c, an alphabetical list, as in Bartsch, of all the songs of the troubadour, with references to the folio or page of the manuscripts where the song may be found, and also references to any printed editions, critical or otherwise. Here the authors follow Bartsch closely, numbering the troubadours in the same order and listing additional names by means of letters added to the number. To Bartsch's list of 460 troubadours, Pillet and Carstens add 22 other names, while subtracting four from those given by him. Thus we have now a total of 478 troubadours known by name, although in some cases no song has been preserved in the known manuscripts. Lastly, after the authentic works, is appended a list of the songs falsely attributed to the troubadour concerned. Each song is listed alphabetically according to its first line. Altogether, this bibliography will be henceforward an incomparable instrument of research.

The final section of the work is formed by an index of all the rimes of the first line of each song given in the bibliography, arranged alphabetically. This too will be a great help to editors of Provençal texts in the future.

The bibliography being the chief part of the work, I have tested the accuracy of the indications found therein in two ways: first, by checking the references to the folio number of the song listed for the two MSS, B and I, of which I possess rotographs; second, by checking the references to the folio (or page) numbers of all the songs of the troubadour Aimeric de Pegulhan, of which I possess copies. The first check proved the absolute accuracy of all the references, although in a few cases the first line of the song in I (never in B) showed slight verbal variations from that given in the bibliography. As, however, the complete index of first lines of the MS I (Bib. nat. franç. 854) is easily accessible in the catalogue of manuscripts of that library, I do not consider it necessary to give these variants here. The second check disclosed one slight error and one omission. The song listed under the number 10, 6 is found in the manuscript R on folio 73, not 75. The song 10, 8 is also found in the manuscript N, f. 106, where it is anonymous. These tests prove the almost complete accuracy of the bibliography.

I append here a few slight additions to the bibliography, citing in each the number of the troubadour: 9. Aimeric de belenoi. A complete edition of this troubadour, by Mlle Marie Dumitrescu, is now in press for the *SATF*. 63. Bernart Marti. The Bibliography probably went to press before the critical edition of the songs of this troubadour by Hoepffner appeared in the *Classiques français*

du moyen âge, 61, 1929, 356, Peire Rogier. The bibliography neglects to state that song 6 of this troubadour is ascribed in I to Bernart de Ventadorn. 437, Sordel. The authors mark with an interrogation point the short *cobla* and *tornada* which appear in De Lollis' edition of this troubadour as number 33, beginning: *Nom meraveill sil marit son gilos*, and were evidently unable to place it. They do not include it in the bibliography nor the rimarium. It is found in I, f. 124, but is not listed in the Bib. nat. catalogue, as it is found immediately following the other *cobla*, number 32, and is not separated from it by a number or sign indicating that it is another song. It should however be so listed, as the rimes and measure are different.

It will be seen from the very slight character of these additions or corrections with what meticulous accuracy the authors have done their work. Doubtless, a close examination of the other unpublished manuscripts might disclose several more variants or additions. But the book is thoroughly trustworthy,—a splendid monument of coöperative scholarship. No one who studies any of the troubadours in the future can afford to neglect it.

WILLIAM P. SHEPARD

Hamilton College

Novelistas españoles modernos. By J. A. BALSEIRO. New York: Macmillan, 1933. Pp. xxi + 476.

Con la buena intención de remediar la escasez de obras generales sobre la moderna novela española, el Sr B. ha escrito un libro que, desgraciadamente, padece los mismos defectos de los ya publicados. No es más completo pues incluye nueve novelistas aislados, comenzando arbitrariamente por Valera y terminando con Palacio Valdés, sin dar en ninguna parte una idea de conjunto sobre la evolución del género. No es más metódico porque las excesivas citas y digresiones, sumadas a los análisis y argumentos de cada una de las novelas, oscurecen la valoración total del autor estudiado. Y, por último, salvo en dos o tres casos, no cambia ninguna de las opiniones generalmente aceptadas, muchas de las cuales necesitarían una completa revisión.

Téngase en cuenta, sin embargo, que el Sr B. no ha querido hacer una historia de la novela, o ficción como él suele decir. Su propósito ha sido reunir en un volumen, con fines principalmente didácticos, unos cuantos ensayos más o menos originales sobre los grandes novelistas, limitándose frecuentemente a resumir juicios ajenos. A veces, sin añadir comentario alguno, sale del paso insertando una carta o medio artículo de tal o cual firma no siempre autorizada. Solamente en el capítulo dedicado a Galdós, hace el

Sr B. cincuenta y tantas citas, algunas de cuatro o cinco páginas, y esto sin contar las frases breves de innumerables críticos españoles y no españoles. El método resulta un tanto abusivo, sobre todo considerando que muchas de estas citas están desprovistas de valor o no vienen a cuento.

Defecto no menos fastidioso es el de las digresiones. El Sr B. se aparta a menudo del asunto que está tratando, para perderse en consideraciones que, aunque a veces sean interesantes, se hallan completamente fuera de lugar. Hay alguna página imposible de ligar con la anterior ni con la siguiente. Y lo más lamentable es que estas digresiones significan un despilfarro de papel que hubiera debido emplearse en cubrir omisiones y en desarrollar algunos temas importantes sobre los cuales el autor pasa muy a la ligera.

Al lado de estas faltas, que cualquier discreto lector podrá notar, el libro tiene varias cualidades estimables. En primer lugar la imparcialidad con que el Sr B. juzga a cada novelista, respetando su credo literario aunque sea opuesto al suyo y desechando toda clase de prejuicios. Ni excesivamente blando ni injustamente duro con nadie, consigue librarse de caer en inútiles apasionamientos. La mayoría de sus juicios, si no siempre acertados, son evidentemente sinceros.

No nos dice el Sr B. nada nuevo sobre Valera, cuya familiar semblanza de escritor mundano, académico y finamente socarrón, reaparece en estas páginas con los mismos rasgos de siempre. Ni sobre Clarín, porque no es nuevo reclamar para él un puesto entre los novelistas de primera fila; ni sobre Palacio Valdés a quien trata con la acostumbrada benevolencia que suele inspirar; ni sobre el P. Coloma, aunque destaca más que otros críticos el tono grosero de *Pequeñeces* y su espíritu anticristiano. En cambio, al hablar de Pereda se aparta de la opinión corriente colocando a *Pedro Sánchez* entre las mejores novelas del siglo diecinueve. Esta afirmación resulta quizá exagerada, pero es cierto que *Pedro Sánchez* tiene por su técnica más moderna—o más antigua si se quiere—un interés que no despiertan otras producciones del tradicionalista hidalgo montañés. Es un punto de enlace entre la novela picaresca y la contemporánea. Baroja, cambiando el estilo y las ideas, hubiera podido escribir una obra muy semejante.

Del cacareado realismo de Pereda, en quien todavía queda mucho de costumbrismo a lo Fernán Caballero, dice el Sr B. que es solamente parcial porque rehuye sistemáticamente el problema erótico, sin duda para no escandalizar a sus píos lectores. Podrían alegarse otras razones que dejarían bastante mal parado el realismo del autor de *La Montálvez* y de *Don G. G. de la G.* La falsedad y la pobreza mental que el Sr B. censura en estas obras, vuelve a encontrarlas en las novelas tendenciosas de Galdós, que le parecen igualmente convencionales. Y con sobrado motivo. Menos funda-

mento tienen otros juicios relacionados con el autor de *Realidad*, cuyas ideas acerca del honor representan, según el Sr B., una revolución en la literatura española. Pero todos los nombres que aduce en apoyo de su aserto son nombres de poetas dramáticos, y tenían que serlo. Los novelistas, ya antes de Galdós—recuérdese *El celoso extremeño*—han sido menos rigurosos en la aplicación del código del honor, y no han dado siempre a la infidelidad conyugal una solución tan simplista como los dramaturgos.

Por falta de consistencia pecan también otras observaciones incluidas en el capítulo dedicado a don Benito—que es sin duda uno de los más endebles y confusos. En cambio, del estudio sobre la Pardo Bazán puede decirse lo contrario. Demuestra aquí el Sr B., al valorar una por una las novelas de la *muy femenina* condesa, que sabe distinguir lo bueno de lo malo y lo malo de lo mediocre, señalando con exactitud los puntos flacos de las obras maestras y los méritos aislados de las que no lo son. Sin embargo, lo más interesante del libro es la insistencia con que el Sr B. califica de romántico a Pedro Antonio de Alarcón. Romántico por *El escándalo* donde se encuentran todas las cualidades, situaciones y frases hechas del romanticismo; romántico por *La Pródiga* y por *El Niño de la Bola*; romántico por sus preferencias literarias—Byron, Espronceda, Zorrilla—y romántico en fin por su juventud misma, fecunda en andanzas, pasiones, duelos, fracasos y rebeldías. Por rutina se ha venido colocando a Alarcón entre los escritores realistas, como continuador de Fernán Caballero. Es un error. Fernán Caballero continúa en Pereda, que hace lo que ella quiso hacer y no pudo, mientras que Alarcón llega con *el Escándalo* adonde no habían llegado los novelistas románticos que le preceden. Falta en esta novela el culto al paisaje, por desarrollarse la acción en Madrid, pero en otras obras suyas, por ejemplo *El Niño de la Bola* o *De Madrid a Nápoles*—sigue el romanticismo—Alarcón rinde, fiel a su escuela, el debido tributo a la naturaleza.

En resumen, *Novelistas españoles modernos* contiene una buena cantidad de material utilizable: datos concretos, análisis concienzudos, observaciones atinadas. Sería de desear que el Sr B. convirtiera todo esto en una verdadera historia de la novela, reduciendo las citas a las imprescindibles; dando mayor ilación a los párrafos, que están como deshilvanados; sustituyendo los argumentos por una más eficaz crítica de conjunto y omitiendo las digresiones innecesarias, con lo cual le sobraría espacio para incluir a los autores que faltan.

JOSÉ ROBLES

Les Odyssées philosophiques en France entre 1616 et 1789. By N. VAN WIJNGAARDEN. Haarlem, 1932. Pp. 257. *Le Royaume d'Antangil, réimprimé sur l'unique édition de Saumur, 1616, avec des éclaircissements de FRÉDÉRIC LACHÈVRE.* Paris, La Connaissance, 1932. Pp. xxviii, 162.

Parmi les nombreuses utopies publiées en France au dix-septième et au dix-huitième siècles, M. Van Wijngaarden en a choisi vingt qui lui semblaient marquer "une réaction contre le système gouvernemental en vigueur du temps des écrivains." Il les a divisées en trois groupes ou trois périodes : avant Louis XIV, alors que le rêve humanitaire avait encore des visées modérées ; sous la monarchie de Louis XIV, où l'absolutisme aurait poussé les utopistes à des attaques violentes contre la religion et à la prédication du communisme intégral ; après la mort de Louis XIV, où en face du rêve communiste certains écrivains auraient proposé une république idéale, mais moins chimérique. C'est donc, en fait, une étude des utopies politiques et non des utopies philosophiques qu'a voulu faire M. Van Wijngaarden, et c'est ce qu'il a fait dans une certaine mesure en s'efforçant de découvrir dans ces récits imaginaires des allusions précises aux mœurs du temps et aux événements politiques. C'est la partie la plus nouvelle et la plus originale de son travail, bien qu'on puisse lui reprocher de pousser au noir, par endroits, la peinture de la vie au dix-septième siècle. Il faut également lui savoir gré d'avoir analysé en détail plusieurs utopies jusqu'ici négligées, en particulier la *Relation du Royaume des Féliciens* (1726) du Marquis de Lassay, la *Découverte de l'Empire de Cantahar* (1730) de Varennes de Mondane et les *Femmes militaires* (1736) de Rustaing de Saint-Jory.

Une fois de plus, nous sommes redevables à M. Lachèvre pour la réimpression d'un texte fort rare et au total d'un intérêt considérable. Cette édition est précédée d'une étude de M. René-Louis Doyon sur les "Variations de l'Utopie," étude qui ne s'impose ni par la sûreté de l'information ni par la justesse des généralisations auxquelles s'est complu l'auteur. La hardiesse aventureuse de M. Doyon est telle que M. Lachèvre lui-même a cru nécessaire de donner une "mise au point" d'un passage sur le règne de Louis XIV. Il aurait pu relever bien d'autres inexactitudes dans la prose de son préfacier. Les hypothèses qu'avait proposées M. Van Wijngaarden au sujet du *Royaume d'Antangil* méritaient plus de considération. M. Lachèvre ne peut cependant accepter que les simples initiales I. D. M. G. T. par lesquelles est désigné l'auteur représentent Jean Du Moulin Gentilhomme Tourangeau, ni que le livre marqué comme imprimé à Saumur par Thomas Portau soit sorti des presses de Jean Le Maire de Leyde. Sa démonstration, que nous ne pou-

vons reproduire ici, paraît concluante. Il faut donc nous résigner à ne point connaître l'auteur anonyme de cet ouvrage curieux qui est dû à la plume d'un ancien officier, féru de récits de voyages, imprégné de Rabelais et sinon calviniste au moins grand admirateur d'un christianisme primitif qui aurait échappé à l'influence de Rome. Sur le livre lui-même il y aurait beaucoup à dire et beaucoup à ajouter aux vingt pages que M. Van Wijngaarden lui a consacrées dans son ouvrage. A juste titre, M. Lachèvre a indiqué les rapports évidents avec l'Utopie de Thomas Morus dont la traduction française avait paru à Paris en 1550. Mais l'auteur a des idées bien à lui et qui à ma connaissance n'avaient jamais été développées en français dans un livre de ce genre. Les chapitres sur le gouvernement sont des plus intéressants à cet égard. Le royaume d'Antangil est en réalité un royaume fédératif, composé de cent-vingt provinces ayant chacune une capitale et une administration distincte. Une représentation nationale de 360 "personnages," choisis également parmi les nobles, les habitants des bourgs et les habitants des villages, est chargée de donner des avis au roi et à son conseil. Le souverain est élu à vie par un conseil de cent "grands et sçavants personnages," âgés de plus de 40 ans, qui ont le pouvoir de déposer "le Roy et le Vice-roy s'ils attentoient à remuer ou innover aucune chose en l'etat." Voilà un système politique logiquement et solidement construit tel qu'on n'en retrouve ni chez Veiras ni chez Foigny et qui, à peu de choses près, est celui que les Fédéralistes auraient voulu instaurer aux Etats-Unis un siècle et demi plus tard. Les raisons de ces ressemblances si curieuses sont d'ailleurs plus simples qu'on ne pourrait croire. C'est que l'auteur d'*Antangil*, comme Montesquieu et les Fédéralistes de la fin du dix-huitième siècle, a lu Polybe et Cicéron. C'est à l'antiquité et non à son imagination qu'il emprunte les éléments essentiels de son gouvernement idéal. Ne serait-ce qu'à ce titre, malgré la gaucherie de son style, il mériterait de retenir l'attention des historiens. Il nous apporte en effet des indications précieuses sur la diffusion de certaines idées que nous avons trop tendances à attribuer au dix-huitième siècle et plus particulièrement au dix-huitième siècle anglais et qui, bien souvent, avaient été entrevues et même développées dès la fin du seizième. Les chapitres sur l'éducation, où l'influence de Rabelais est évidente, mais qui marquent sur le *Pantagruel* et le *Gargantua* un progrès évident, sont non moins dignes d'attention. C'est déjà d'une université moderne plus que d'une abbaye de Thélème que rêve l'auteur d'*Antangil*, et si les exercices militaires ne sont pas oubliés, la préparation que reçoivent les jeunes gens a pour objet essentiel de les préparer aux fonctions de l'Etat et de leur permettre de parvenir aux honneurs autrement que par "achapts, ventes, troques ou faveur." Avec trop de modestie, M. Lachèvre s'est refusé à

mettre en lumière tout ce qu'il y avait d'original dans cette "première utopie française." Il mérite toute notre reconnaissance pour avoir le premier signalé et mis à notre disposition un texte dont la valeur littéraire peut être médiocre, mais qui constitue un document de premier ordre pour les historiens des idées.

GILBERT CHINARD

Classical Mythology and Arthurian Romance. A Study of the Sources of Chrestien de Troyes' "Yvain" and Other Arthurian Romances. By CHARLES BERTRAM LEWIS. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford Univ. Press; New York: Oxford Univ. Press, 1932. Pp. xviii + 332.

In Arthurian romance it is necessary for each new champion to slay his predecessor if he would become the guardian of the fountain. So it is with Arthurian scholarship. Dr. Lewis surveys the whole field of theory regarding the sources of Chrétien de Troyes, and vanquishes every foe. Of those who believe in Celtic origins he observes that none has proposed any adequate explanation of the "storm-spring theme" in the *Yvain*. For this a parallel has long been recognized in Ulrich's *Lanzelet*, where the spring is located in the oak forest of Dodona. Dr. Lewis infers that the motif in both instances has to do with a survival of rain-making ritual (as Nitze once suggested), and that it is derived specifically from the cult of Zeus at Dodona, where there were oak-grove, spring, and rainmaking. The episode in *Yvain* is examined in detail in the present study, and similarities are pointed out in the ceremony attached to the cult of the thunder-god. The reasoning is close and the evidence important. We must be grateful that the case is presented in so thorough a fashion by one who testifies that he himself was convinced against his will. Every possibility of a source or analogue for the story should be presented and duly scrutinized, and critics should rejoice if anyone who offers a new hypothesis shows fervor.

But we do not stop here. The ceremony of the new priest defeating the old at Dodona is, we are informed, reflected in the Joie de la Cort episode of the *Erec* and in many other stories. For both the *Yvain* and the *Erec* Chrétien drew considerably on the adventure of Theseus with the Minotaur. The *Lancelot* gives us again the rape of Helen of Troy, and the *Perceval* offers anew the material connected with the house of Atreus. Such a brief summary of the conclusions alone doubtless seems unfair; for it lacks the support of the rich detail in the argument, and any feeling for the skill and sobriety with which, early in the book, the author

proceeds. But the fault is ultimately his own. By statements here and there we soon discover the goal toward which he is rushing: "If, then, there is nothing Celtic in *Erec et Enide*, and nothing Celtic in *Yvain*, there is in all probability nothing Celtic in any other Arthurian romance . . ." (p. 240). "Lastly, the story of *La Mule sanz frair* might well be a mediaeval travesty of the journey of Herakles to the land of the Amazons where he won the girdle of Queen Hippolyte" (p. 296). "If this conception of the genesis of the Breton romances is correct, it is evident that the whole theory of the Celtic sources of the Arthurian poems is badly shaken, not to say overthrown, and we can now, without any qualms, relegate it to the limbo of more or less plausible but wrecked hypotheses" (p. 297).

Now this is not temperate scholarship. It is not even controversy. One is tempted to burlesque the whole proposition by asking what conspiracy was afoot to prompt writers from Nennius to Malory thus to set forth a classical heritage in disguise. Was there nothing available nearer at hand, say a story now called the beheading-game, or some tale of a journey to fairy-land, or a bit of narrative about a fairy-mistress, to give a more authentic touch of the obviously desired Celtic quality? Let us for the time being waive the question as to whether the theory of Celtic origins may be regarded as established; the fact is that the evidence collected to-day is vast, and Dr. Lewis cannot deal with more than a very little of it. He has plenty to do in his attempt to establish his own case for the influence of the cult of Zeus. Whether or not he has a right to call Loomis's theory far-fetched, he forgets how much his own discussion is built on inferences. For example on page 40 in studying the rites of Dodona he says: "In the following pages we hope to be able to show that Mr. Cook's conjecture is correct, that succession to the priesthood and kingship was indeed decided by a struggle to the death between the king and his rival." But the following pages derive from this conjecture! And later we read the confident statement that "when the priestly king of Dodona was eventually defeated and slain, he was succeeded in his charge by his assailant, who cut off his head and fixed it on the castle wall or impaled it on a stake" (p. 126). The circle is clear.

He objects that the proponents of the Celtic theory have no likely parallel to offer for the storm-raising spring; but he himself can show no real reflection of the labyrinth episode in Chrétien, and surely this is an essential feature of the adventure with the Minotaur. His sources in Greek for the grail and the lance it is hard to take seriously. The similarity of Chrétien's tree with the birds to the oak with three doves, even if the doves increased and multiplied, is not impressive. The cumulative force of analogies like these does not tell in the fashion that he hopes. One even

finds a hint (pp. 265-266) of some connection between the blood-drops on the snow which remind Perceval of his lady's cheeks (and us of the Celtic use of color in description) and bloody drops in Aeschylus which pleaded "for other bloodshed." The only trouble is that "in Chrestien's poem that passage is out of place. In Chrestien's source it must have preceded the act of revenge" (p. 266, n. 1). But what about the actual documents used by the French poet? Can Lewis show a closer analogue than any so far offered by Brown or other scholars? I take the most important, the hypothetical source of the storm-spring episode. Of this the author tells us that Chrétien probably knew more than one version (p. 132). The author of the *Bel Inconnu* went back to one of these at a point where his account is more like the original than Chrétien's (p. 115). Presumably Ulrich von Zatzikhoven knew at least one for reasons already indicated. In dealing with his source, moreover, Chrétien made important changes in his material (p. 142). It is surprising, then, to learn that of these several documents not a trace survives.

The risk of using circumstantial evidence in Arthurian scholarship is like that of hunting for acrostic signatures. The verdict is likely to be fatal all round. The best part of the present study is that related to the question of the spring itself, and the rest can be dispensed with. For the adventure of Yvain in general the idea of an Otherworld journey has the support at least of medieval writers, as Brown has shown. Yvain was one of the heroes who had the reputation of having traveled to the Otherworld, and I suspect that they knew more about him than we do. If Chrétien changed the Minotaur into the Herdsman, then he not only missed the quality of the classics, but he adopted, if I may have my guess, a Celtic manner. The *Isle as Puceles* is less satisfactorily explained by the tribute of the Minotaur than by the Celtic maidenland. In general one is not persuaded that the analogues proposed are close; and one observes that Dr. Lewis takes precious little account of literary coincidence as a possibility, and that he ignores the idea of a common literary inheritance, like that of the so-called Aryan expulsion and return formula. If, then, we ignore everything in his study except the "storm-spring theme" we may grant provisionally that Chrétien derived the idea of the spring itself from Dodona and its rites. But even here we find that Lewis shows that the cult of the thunder-god reached Gallic territory early (p. 210), and so the spring itself may have been taken over without the further detail of the ceremony, which, we recall, was largely hypothetical. On second thoughts it is astonishing how little we really know about Dodona! After all, even today, any scholar who blows a horn near the Arthurian fountain is likely to bring a thunder-storm down on his head.

HOWARD R. PATCH

Smith College

The Dramatic Works and Translations of Sir William Lower. With a Reprint of The Enchanted Lovers. By WILLIAM BRYAN GATES. Philadelphia, 1932. Pp. 166. (University of Pennsylvania Thesis.)

The place of Sir William Lower among the cavalier dramatists has too long been obscured. It is fitting that he should at last receive attention and that his original plays should be reprinted. Mr. Gates reviews Lower's life, discusses his translations from Corneille, Quinault, and Scarron, presents an analysis of *The Phaenix in Her Flames* and *The Enchanted Lovers*, with an examination of their sources, and evaluates Lower's blank verse. The reprint of *The Enchanted Lovers*, appended to this essay, will be welcomed by all students of pre-Restoration drama.

Although Mr. Gates does not claim for Lower a higher rank than that of "a third or fourth rate writer," some of the limitations of the dramatist are not illustrated. Passages might well have been cited to indicate Lower's obliviousness to such characteristics of Corneille's style as balance, alliteration, and conciseness. As Mr. Gates would acknowledge, it signifies little that the translator has been "faithful to the sense of the original" who adapts Corneille's lines:

Quand je vois de tes murs leur armée et la nôtre,
Mes trois frères dans l'une, et mon mari dans l'autre,¹

as:

When I see drawn up 'fore thy walls both Armies,
my three brave Brothers in the one, and my
undaunted Husband in the other . . .²

The criticism of Lower's dramatic technique in his original plays is very much to the point; and the vigor of one of his portraits, the Fletcherian heroine Ismenia, is rightly commended. In the final chapter one misses critical comment on Lower's romantic temper.

Following, in the main, Thomas Secombe's sketch of Lower's life in the *DNB.*, Mr. Gates has added a few details, chiefly regarding Lower's exile in Holland. The attempt, in the succeeding chapters, to envisage Lower as "strictly a man of his age" is not wholly successful, since, while urging other aspects of Lower's romanticism, Mr. Gates discounts too much the influence of contemporary Platonism. The indebtedness of Lower to famous romances by Heliodorus and Eustathius is emphasized, in the latter case, too strongly. *Les Amours d'Ismene et d'Isménias* could not have suggested to Lower the Arcadian paradise of *The Enchanted Lovers*, secondary characters who display love's caprices in the pastoral manner, and a ruthless enchantress who tyrannizes over her victims. Evidences of the influence of contemporary English

¹ Horace, I, i.

² Horatius, I, i.

dramatists on Lower should have been noted. The conduct of a number of the Platonic ladies of Carlell and D'Avenant might have set Mr. Gates' mind at rest as to Lucinda's "frank, direct manner" of courting Amandus. Among the probable sources of *The Phaenix in Her Flames* should be listed Carlell's *The Deserving Favourite* (pr. 1629). The fortunes of Lower's Lucinda in several respects parallel those of Carlell's Cleonarda. Both princesses fall in love at first sight with wounded heroes, whose wounds they dress and to whom they confess their love. The young men, whose affections are elsewhere engaged, politely check these advances. Shortly before the close of her adventures, Cleonarda declares that if the God of Love will not aid her, she will devote to the service of Diana "the loath'd remnant of my life." Lucinda, at Amandus' death, is to carry out such a project, vowing to renounce all pleasures and spend "the remnant of my dayes" as Diana's votary. The rôle of Alecto recalls that of Iacomo. Both villains seek to advance their own fortunes by ruining rival lovers. Professing friendship, Iacomo informs the Duke of Lysander's love for Clarinda, which he discovered through eavesdropping, and suggests Lysander's murder. Alecto adopts a similar course with Perseus. In both cases, the proposal of murder is rejected, and the lovers oppose each other in a duel. The fact that Lower makes use of conventions of Platonic intrigue strengthens Mr. Gates' contention that minor writers frequently "show best the direction of the literary currents of a period."

KATHLEEN M. LYNCH

Mount Holyoke College

Thomas Mann's Novel 'Der Zauberberg.' A Study by HERMANN J. WEIGAND. New York-London: D. Appleton-Century Company, 1933. Pp. ix, 183.

Dr. Weigand's study of Thomas Mann's novel *Der Zauberberg* seems like an answer to the demand put forward in Professor Martin Schütze's recently published *Academic Illusions* that scholars in the field of literature occupy themselves less with the minutiae of "research" and devote more attention to esthetic appreciation of the works of great authors. This thoughtful, thorough guide to the very core of a subtle work of art makes one feel that perhaps Professor Schütze sees things a bit too darkly in his description of our graduate instruction in literature; for when a professor's interests are of the sort manifested by the author of our volume his classroom instruction cannot fail to infect his students with a similar spirit.

A brief review cannot even sketch the numerous facets of *Der Zauberberg* which Dr. Weigand reveals. He classifies the work as a Bildungsroman along with Goethe's *Wilhelm Meister*, Keller's *Grüner Heinrich*, and Stifters *Nachsommer*. He shows it to be, among other things, symbolical in Goethe's sense of the word, a *Zeitroman* indicting the pre-war Western civilization, a spiritual autobiography of Thomas Mann, a philosophical novel concerned with man's relation to the universe as a whole, and a didactic work calling the German nation to an observance of their highest cultural ideals. In his *The Modern Ibsen*, published nine years ago, Dr. Weigand by patient, detailed analysis revealed much that lies beneath the surface in the enigmatic Scandinavian, and in the present work he delves with the same shrewdness into the psycho-analytical background of the hero. He brings a broad literary knowledge to bear on his discussion of Thomas Mann's relation to the Romantics in the chapters dealing with "disease" and "irony." He shows, by the way, that Thomas Mann, the realist, has his hero's notion (derived from Novalis and other Romantics) that disease brings about greater sensibility or spirituality, turn into disillusionment after a short experience in the sanitarium. Striking too are the consequences which Dr. Weigand in the last chapter draws from the seance. It is a great temptation to mention more examples from the wealth of fascinating material in the book, but I shall call attention to but one more: the discussion in the notes of Thomas Mann's revision of his *Betrachtungen eines Unpolitischen* after Germany had become a republic.

Dr. Weigand's analysis of Thomas Mann's subtle and daring effort at "integration" in this all-comprehensive novel is masterful, but one may doubt his judgment as to its artistic success. He is not unaware of the pedantry that obtrudes itself in the composition of *Der Zauberberg*, but he meets this charge with an argument by analogy (p. 92): "I suppose the Gothic cathedrals, too, were pedantic in their articulation." Somehow this does not sound quite convincing. Since our author frequently compares *Der Zauberberg* with *Wilhelm Meister* I should like to hazard a judgment in the form of a ratio: *re* artistic unity and vitality *Der Zauberberg* is to *Buddenbrooks* as *Wilhelm Meister* is to *Hermann und Dorothea*—which latter work Schiller called the peak of Goethe's artistic production.

A. E. ZUCKER

University of Maryland

BRIEF MENTION

Alfred de Vigny, Contribution à sa Biographie Intellectuelle. Par F. BALDENSPERGER. Etudes Françaises, Trentième Cahier. Paris, "Les Belles-Lettres," 1933. Pp. 200. Dans ce volume, M. Baldensperger a réuni huit études dont quelques-unes avaient déjà paru sous forme d'articles et qui toutes apportent des renseignements précieux sur la formation intellectuelle de Vigny et la portée de son œuvre. Nous ne pouvons les analyser en détail ici; il sera cependant permis de signaler la première dans laquelle se trouve reconstitué le milieu ancestral de Vigny. Le chapitre sur les "Mercredis de Vigny" permet de préciser le prestige dont le poète jouissait, malgré la renommée éclatante de Hugo, auprès d'un groupe d'amis discrets et dévoués qui lui restèrent fidèles même après qu'il se fut retiré au Maine Giraud. L'étude sur "Les Etats-Unis dans la vie et l'œuvre d'Alfred de Vigny" révèle un Vigny américanisant, non point simple disciple de Chateaubriand, mais curieux d'histoire américaine, suivant Tocqueville, consultant Emile Chevalier et lisant les traités religieux de Channing. Enfin dans les remarques critiques sur le titre du recueil posthume de Vigny, "Destinées" ou "Poèmes philosophiques," M. Baldensperger étudie, avec plus de détails qu'il n'avait pu le faire dans la préface de son édition publiée en juillet 1914, non pas seulement le titre que Vigny comptait donner à ses derniers poèmes, mais l'ordre probable dans lequel il les aurait présentés. Il montre en particulier, comment une étiquette que l'auteur n'aurait peut-être pas choisie a pu conférer au recueil une intention implicite "d'absolu pessimisme" qui n'était pas dans la pensée du poète.

G. C.

Étude sur les Epistres Morales d'Honoré d'Urfé. Par SŒUR MARIE LUCIEN GOUDARD. Washington: Catholic University of America, 1933. Pp. 164. Although five or six editions of this work appeared between 1598 and 1620, it seems to have been so soon forgotten that d'Urfé remained for most readers the author of the *Astrée* alone. Yet these discourses have some importance for an understanding of the author and of his novel and constitute one of the links in the chain of thought that connects the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Sister Goudard points out the Stoic and Neo-Platonic elements in the epistles and shows in detail the very considerable debt that d'Urfé owed to Plutarch. She reserves for future investigation a similar study of his borrowings from Ficino. It would also be of interest to indicate the connection between the

thought of the *Epistres* and that of the *Astrée*. She has made her investigation with great thoroughness and admirable impartiality, even in handling such difficult questions as Saint Bartholomew's and the League. She admits that the *Epistres* "ne contiennent rien d'original" and that "leur vogue ne survécut guère à l'auteur." As she claims so little for her subject, one is the more inclined to accept her conclusion that it deserves more than "le coup d'œil rapide des curieux."

H. C. L.

Friesche Dialectgeographie. Door J. J. HOF. Martinus Nijhoff 's-Gravenhage 1933. Pp. xiv, 277, met 68 Kaarten. This splendid work devoted to a study of the gradually disappearing Frisian language of the county of Westfriesland in Holland is essentially phonetic in character. The phonetic differences between the various dialects are represented graphically in 67 small maps in addition to a large one showing the whole area in a great part of which only small enclaves remain in which Frisian is still spoken. That the work has been carefully done and is reliable is evident from the control methods the author has employed, one of which I wish especially to call attention to, mentioned on page xiv of the Introduction: "die, toen ik mijn werk bij gedeelten in het Leeuwarder Nieuwsblad deed verschijnen (vooral met het doel, de verzamelde feiten een tijdlang onder 'publieke controle' te stellen) mij konden gerieven met welkome aanvullingen en verbeteringen." That such a procedure is of the greatest importance in the matter of studies in modern dialects is apparent to every one. Especially interesting and valuable for the Germanic philologist and for the student of dialects in general is the for the most part successful attempt to discover the origin and trace the direction of the sound changes discussed.

E. H. SEHRT

George Washington University

The Social Criticism of Fenimore Cooper. By JOHN E. ROSS. University of California Publications in English, Vol. III, No. 2, pp. 17-118. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1933. \$1.50. Dr. Ross has added to the recent discussions of Fenimore Cooper's social and political ideas an essay which shows grasp of essentials and logic of exposition rather than novelty or thoroughness of analysis. His main points are sound: that Cooper was a critic by temperament and a writer of romance by accident; that his apparent change in attitude after his return from Europe in 1833 was more a change in the times than in the man; and that his

social criticism, although not radical in theory, was directed against many factors in American life which persist today. Dr. Ross has stated his case with admirable clarity, and, by an analysis of the *Notions of the Americans*, *The American Democrat*, *The Monikins*, *Home as Found*, and *The Sea Lions*, has begun to fill in his generalizations with judgment. But his treatment of the great bulk of Cooper's work, particularly of the later novels of manners and social history, is inadequate; his knowledge of the background of the times is based almost wholly on secondary sources; and his discussions of the personal controversies in which the irate critic engaged in his later years is cursory. The monograph makes a good introduction to the subject, but its contribution lies in its interpretive rather than in its analytical power.

ROBERT E. SPILLER

Swarthmore College

Aspects of Shakespeare: Being British Academy Lectures. By L. ABERCROMBIE, E. K. CHAMBERS, H. GRANVILLE-BARKER, W. W. GREG, E. LEGOUIS, A. W. POLLARD, C. F. E. SPURGEON, A. [H.] THORNDIKE, and J. D. WILSON. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1933. Pp. vii + 286. \$3.75. These are the lectures from 1923 to 1931. Since nearly all appeared as brochures, one need here but remind the reader of the first-rate importance of Mr. Pollard's pronunciamiento (1923) on "The Foundations of Shakespeare's Text," of Sir Edmund Chambers's defence of the accepted canon in "The Disintegration of Shakespeare," of Mr. Granville-Barker's plea ("From 'Henry V' to 'Hamlet'") for clearer recognition of the contribution which can be made by further examination (and, if possible, exemplification) of histrionic considerations, and of Dr. Greg's exposition ("Principles of Emendation in Shakespeare") of the interdependence of emendation and textual theory.

H. S.

CORRESPONDENCE

LONGFELLOW "UNDISCOVERED." I regret to learn that the bit of verse from Longfellow that I contributed to the last number of *MLN* as a "hitherto undiscovered" poem entitled *The River* is in reality three stanzas from *The River Charles* and consequently appears in the author's collected poems.

ESTHER C. AVERILL

5 Rupert Street,
Worcester, Mass.

NECROLOGY

DAVID S. BLONDHEIM

The Editors of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES express in these lines their sorrow over the sudden death on March 19 of their colleague, David S. Blondheim. Born in Baltimore in 1884, he was long closely associated with The Johns Hopkins University as student and teacher. He received his A. B. degree there in 1906, his Ph. D. in 1910; he held the Romance fellowship in 1909-10, was a Johnston scholar in 1913-14, became a member of the faculty in 1917, and was made Professor of Romance Philology in 1924. He had taught at the University of Illinois in 1910-17. He was an advisory editor of MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES from 1917 to the time of his death.

While the articles and reviews that he published in leading Romance journals, the dissertations he directed, and the undertakings he helped to organize show that he had a wide range of interests, including the history of culture and of literature, syntax, etymology, the constitution of texts, and lexicography, his main contributions to knowledge were in a single field, that of Judeo-Romance. Here he continued the work of Arsène Darmesteter and became the leading authority in the world on the subject. His principal publications were: *Contribution à la lexicographie française d'après des sources rabbiniques*; *Essai d'un vocabulaire comparatif des parlers judéo-romans*; *Les Parlers judéo-romans et la Vetus latina*; *Poèmes judéo-français du moyen âge*; *Les Gloses françaises dans les commentaires talmudiques de Raschi*; *Liste des manuscrits des commentaires bibliques de Raschi*. These studies threw much light both on the history of the French language and on the culture and vocabulary of Medieval Jews. It is most unfortunate that he was unable to finish his study of Raschi's Biblical glosses, but it is hoped that some two hundred of them, the investigation of which he had completed, may before long be published.

Romance scholars will all feel the loss of his stimulating and exacting scholarship, and he will be especially missed by those who depended upon his vast knowledge and sound judgment in matters of linguistic history. He had a remarkably keen mind, an extraordinary knowledge of languages, and a great zest for exploring regions that had seldom been visited before his time. American scholars may well take pride in his achievement. They will deeply regret the loss of what in twenty more years of labor he might have accomplished.

RECENT PUBLICATIONS

ENGLISH

[The *English* list includes only books received.]

Allen, Ralph Bergen.—Old Icelandic Source in the English Novel. Diss. *Philadelphia*: 1933. Pp. 122.

Buck, Philo M., Jr. (ed.).—An Anthology of World Literature. *New York*: Macmillan 1934. Pp. xii + 1016. \$4.00.

De Vane, William Clyde (ed.).—The Shorter Poems of Robert Browning. *New York*: F. S. Crofts & Co., 1934. Pp. xxiv + 390. \$1.25.

Eccles, Mark.—Christopher Marlowe in London. *Cambridge*: Harvard Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 186. \$2.50. (Harvard Studies in Eng., X.)

Gebert, Clara.—An Anthology of Elizabethan Dedications and Prefaces. Diss. *Philadelphia*: Univ. of Penn. Press, 1933. Pp. x + 302.

Grenfell, Sir Wilfred.—The Romance of Labrador. *New York*: Macmillan, 1934. Pp. xvi + 330. \$4.00.

Harrold, Charles Frederick.—Carlyle and German Thought. *New Haven*: Yale Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. xii + 346. \$2.50. (Yale Studies in Eng., LXXXII.)

Hoops, Reinald.—Der Einfluss der Psychoanalyse auf die englische Literatur. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1934. Pp. viii + 340. 10 M. (Anglistische Forschungen, 77.)

Kern, John Dwight.—Constance Fenimore Woolson. Diss. *Philadelphia*: Univ. of Penn. Press, 1934. Pp. viii + 198.

Nangle, Benjamin Christie.—The Monthly Review, First Series, 1749-1789, Indexes of Contributors and Articles. *Oxford*: Clarendon Press, 1934. Pp. xvi + 256. \$5.00.

Ramsay, Robert; Read, Allen; Leech, Esther.—Introduction to a Survey of Missouri Place-Names. *Columbia*: Univ. of Missouri, 1934. Pp. 124. \$1.25. (The Univ. of Missouri Studies.)

Stein, Harold.—Studies in Spenser's Complaints. *New York*: Oxford Univ. Press, 1934. Pp. xii + 196. \$2.50.

GERMAN

Bach, Adolf.—Deutsche Mundartenforschung. Ihre Wege, Ergebnisse und Aufgaben. Eine Einführung. [Germanische Bibliothek, 1. Abt. Sammlung germanischer Elementar- und Handbücher, 1. Reihe, Bd. 18]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1934. xiv, 179 pp. M. 6.50.

Bescher, Hermann.—Die Grundlagen der Mundartgeographie des südlichen Rheinhessens. Diss. *Giessen*: 1933. 57 pp.

Bretschneider, Anneliese.—Die Heliand-heimat und ihre sprachgeschichtliche Entwicklung [Deutsche Dialektgeographie. H. 30]. *Marburg*: Elwert, 1934. vii, 322 pp. M. 16.80.

Castle, Eduard.—Deutsch-österreichische Literaturgeschichte. Ein Handbuch z. Gesch. der deutschen Dichtung in Österreich-Ungarn. Nach dem Tode von Joh. Willibald Nagl u. Jakob Zeidler hrsg. Dritter (Schluss-) Band. 1848-1918. 11. Abt. *Wien*: Carl Fromme, 1934. Pp. 1593-1752.

Claus, Horst.—Studien zur Geschichte des deutschen Frühnaturalismus. Die deutsche Literatur von 1880-1890. Diss. Greifswald. *Halle*: Akademischer Verlag, 1933. 100 pp. M. 3.80.

Cordes, Gerhard.—Schriftwesen und Schriftsprache in Goslar bis zur Aufnahme der nhd. Schriftsprache. [Sprache u. Volkstum. 3]. *Hamburg*: Wachholtz, 1934. xii, 117 pp. 4°. M. 3.

Cruse, Ulrich.—August Lewald und seine zeitgeschichtliche Bedeutung. [Sprache u. Kultur d. germ.-roman. Völker. Reihe B, Bd. 6]. *Breslau*: H. Priebatsch, 1933. 118 pp. M. 4.

Dippel, Paul Gerhardt.—Nietzsche und Wagner. Eine Untersuchung über die Grundlagen und Motive ihrer Trennung. [Sprache und Dichtung. H. 54]. *Bern*: Haupt, 1934. 100 pp. M. 3.20.

Elster, Hanns Martin.—Ernst von Wildenbruch. Leben, Werk, Persönlichkeit. *Berlin*: Grote, 1934. 96 pp. M. 1.

Fink, Fritz.—Friedr. Joh. Justin Bertuch. Der Schöpfer des Weimarer Landes-Industrie-Comptoirs (1747-1822). [Persönlichkeiten des klassischen Weimar. H. 1 = Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Stadt Weimar. H. 35/36]. *Weimar*: Fink, 1934. 32 pp. M. 1.

— Carl Ludwig Fernow. Der Bibliothekar der Herzogin Anna Amalia. (1763-1808). [Persönlichkeiten des klassischen Weimar. H. 2 = Beiträge z. Gesch. d. Stadt Weimar. H. 37/38]. *Weimar*: Fink, 1934. 30 pp. M. 1.

Freiwald, Curt.—Hugo von Hofmannsthal's Landschaftserlebnis im Wandel seiner dichterischen Gestalt. Diss. *Kiel*: 1933. 175 pp.

Güntert, Hermann.—Der Ursprung der Germanen. [Kultur u. Sprache. Bd. 9]. *Heidelberg*: Winter, 1934. 192 pp. M. 3.

Habetin, Rudolf.—Die Lyrik Hölderlins im Verhältnis zur Lyrik Goethes und Schillers. Diss. Leipzig. *Schwarzenberg, Sachsen*: Gärtner, 1933. 63 pp.

Hain, Mathilde.—Studien über das Wesen des frühexpressionistischen Dramas. [Frankfurter Quellen u. Forschungen zur german. u. roman. Philologie. H. 5]. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Diesterweg, 1933. 102 pp. M. 3.20.

Hilpert, Walter.—Johann Georg Hamann als Kritiker der deutschen Literatur. Diss. *Königsberg*: 1933. 141 pp.

Humboldt, Wilhelm von.—Briefe an Joh Gottfried Schweighäuser. Zum ersten Mal nach d. Orig. hrsg. u. erl. von Albert Leitzmann. [Jenaer germanistische Forschungen. 25]. *Jena*: Frommann, 1934. 82 pp. M. 3.80.

Kaufmann, Fritz.—Sprache als Schöpfung. Zur absoluten Kunst im Hinblick auf Rilke. [S.-A. aus Zs. f. Ästhetik u. allg. Kunstwissenschaft. Bd. 28]. *Stuttgart*: Enke, 1934. 54 pp. 4°. M. 2.50.

Langen, August.—Anschauungsformen in der deutschen Dichtung des 18. Jhs. (Rahmenschau und Rationalismus) [= Deutsche Arbeiten der Univ. Köln]. *Jena*: Diederichs, 1934. 131 pp. M. 6.

Milch, Werner.—Hermann Stehr. Seine dichterische Welt und ihre Probleme. *Berlin*: Goldstein, 1934. 57 pp. M. 2.

Notkers des Deutschen Werke nach den Handschriften neu hrsg. von E. H. Sehr und Taylor Starck. Ersten Bandes drittes Heft: Boethius de consolatione philosophiae IV/V. [Altdeutsche Textbibliothek No. 34]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. Pp. 245-403. M. 4.

Reimers, Armin.—Die Gefährdung der Familiengemeinschaft durch den Individualismus in Aug. Wilh. Ifflands Dramen von 1781 bis 1811. Diss. Kiel. *Quakenbrück*: Kleinert, 1933. 114 pp.

Schröbler, Ingeborg.—Wikingische und spielmännische Elemente im zweiten Teile des Gudrunliedes. [Rheinische Beiträge u. Hilfsbücher zur germanischen Philologie u. Volkskunde, Bd. 20]. *Halle*: Niemeyer, 1934. xxiv, 111 pp. M. 4.80.

Schütze, Georg.—Das Naturgefühl um die Mitte des 18. Jhs. in der Lyrik von Pyra bis Claudius. Diss. *Leipzig*: Fromhold & Wendler, 1933. 169 pp. typewritten.

Schwarz, Bertha.—Das Gottesbild in höfischer Dichtung. *Bonn*: Cohen, 1933. vii, 120 pp. M. 2.50.

Stöckli, Alban.—Hartmann von Aue. Neue Ergebnisse der Forschung. *Basel*: Gebr Hess in Komm., 1933. 75 pp. Fr. 2.80.

Tarlach, Hans.—Veit Weber und seine Dichtungen. Ein Beitrag zur Erforschung des 15. Jh. Diss. *Greifswald*: Adler, 1933. 115 pp.

Wesly, Margot.—Das junge Mädchen im deutschen Roman des 18. Jhs. bis zum Beginn des Sturm und Dranges. (Unter bes. Berücksichtigung des gleichzeitigen französischen und englischen Romans). Diss. *Leipzig*: 1933. 96 pp.

Wortig, Ilse.—Der "Wendepunkt" in der neuen deutschen Novelle und seine Gestaltung. Diss. *Frankfurt a. M.*: Schröder, 1933. 55 pp.

FRENCH

Beauchêne, Paul de.—La Maison de Racine. *Paris*: Picard, 1934. 95 pp. Fr. 15.

Calvet, J.—Polyeucte, de Corneille, étude et analyse. *Paris*: Mellottée, 1933. 319 pp.

Charreyron, P.—La famille limousine de V. Hugo. *Limoges*: Soc. du Centre, 1933, 28 pp.

Enfances Guillaume, chanson de geste du XIII^e s., éd. J. L. Perrier. *New York*: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1933. ix + 151 pp.

Feuillerat, A.—Comment Marcel Proust a composé son roman. *New Haven*: Yale Press, 1934. 314 pp. \$2.50.

Gazier, Cécile.—Mme de Sévigné. *Paris*: Flammarion, 1934. 224 pp. Fr. 12.

Ghisalberti, F.—L' "Ovidius moralizatus" di Pierre Bersuire. *Rome*: Tip. Cuggiani, 1933. 136 pp.

Gigli, L.—Vita di Gobineau. *Milano*: V. Bompiani, 1933. 307 pp. L. 10.

Gobineau et Prokesch-Osten.—Corresp., éd. C. Serpeille. *Paris*: Plon, 1933. vii + 411 pp.

Grosclaude, P.—La Vie intellectuelle à Lyon dans la deuxième moitié du XVIII^e s. *Paris*: Picard, 1933. ii + 467 pp. Fr. 40.

Guddorf, H.—Der Stil Flauberts. Diss. *Münster*: 1933. 85 pp.

Güllicke, K.-H.—Der Einfluss Tolstojs auf das franz. Geistesleben. Diss. *Bonn*: 1933. 74 pp.

Haschke, F.—Die Sprache Richelieus. *Paris*: Droz, 1934.

Henriot, E.—Courrier litt. XVII^e s. *Paris*: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1933. 237 pp. Fr. 12.

Hilka, A.—Eine altfranz. moralisierende Bearbeitung des Liber de monstruosis hominibus orientis aus Thomas von Cantimpré. *Berlin*: Weidmann, 1933. 73 pp.

Hugo.—Ruy Blas, éd. M. Levaillant. *Paris*: Delagrave, 1933. 228 pp.

Jäckel, K.—Bergson und Proust. *Breslau*: Priebatsch, 1934. 129 pp. Rm. 6. (Sprache u. Kultur der Germ.-Rom. Völker.)

Jäger, M.—Die Erzählungstechnik R. Rollands im "Jean-Christophe." *Münster*: Rom. Sem., 1933. iv + 43 pp.

Jördens, W.—Die franz. Ödipusdramen. *Bochum-Langendreer*: H. Pöppinghaus, 1934. 149 pp.

Korwin-Piotrowska.—Balzac et le monde slave. 2 vols. *Paris*: Champion, 1934. 519 + 120 pp. Fr. 80. (Bibl. de la RLC.)

Maranini, Lorenza.—Proust. Arte e conoscenza. *Firenze*: "Novissima," 1933. ix + 273 pp. L. 15. (Biblioteca di lettere.)

Montaigne.—Selected Essays, ed. A. Tilley and A. M. Boase. *Manchester*: Univ. Press, 1934. xxix + 252 pp. 4/6.

Neumann, H. — Das Deutschland-Erlebnis bei E. Quinet. *Hamburg: Rom. Sem., 1933.* 95 pp.

Osterwalder, T. — Beiträge zur Kenntnis des Dialektes von Magland (Hochsavoyen). *Leipzig: Rom. Sem., 1933.* 85 pp.

Oxford rapid-reading Fr. texts based on word-frequency: H. Bernay, *L'Armure du Magyar* (62 pp.), *Chasseurs de papillons* (63 pp.), *Le Solopendre* (64 pp.), L. Boutinon, *La Mission de Slim Kerrigan* (60 pp.) (ed. Scott and Storey); V. Bonhoure, *Un Drame sous la régence* (64 pp., ed. C. S. Musgrave); H. Bacon, *Cica, la Fille du bandit* (64 pp., ed. L. Humphreys); M. Leblanc, *Carafe d'eau*, etc. (64 pp., ed. R. W. Hartland); E. de Riche, *Le Raid fantastique* (64 pp., ed. A. Rose); G. Leroux, *Le Mystère de la chambre jaune* (64 pp., ed. A. Owen); A. Dumas, *La Prisonnière du Temple* (64 pp., ed. Ducroix and Herbert); M. Dekobra, *Ma Princesse chérie* (64 pp., ed. R. W. Hartland); H. Cauvain, *L'Aiguille qui tue* (64 pp., ed. P. W. Packer). *New York and London: Oxford Univ. Press, 1932-4.* Each \$0.40.

Platz, W. — Renouvier als Kritiker der franz.: Kultur. *Bonn: Röhrscheid, 1934.* 128 pp.

Porciani, Jole. — Sulla questione del "Misanthrope" di Molière. *Livorno: R. Giusti, 1933.* 21 pp.

Praviel, A. — Le Roman douloureux d'A. de Vigny. *Paris: Edit. de France.* Fr. 15.

Radmann, L. — Der Stil C. Marots. *Diss. Frankfurt: 93 pp.*

Ranyard, R. — La Découverte des restes de Ronsard. *Paris: Sauvegarde de l'art fr., 1933.* 25 pp. Fr. 5.

Reichenburg, Marguerite. — Essai sur les lectures de Rousseau. *Diss. Philadelphia: 1932.* 210 pp.

Röder, J. — Das Fürstenbild in den mittelalterlichen Fürstenspiegeln auf franz.: Boden. *Diss. Münster: 1933.* 98 pp.

Roya, M. — Le plus grand amour de G. Sand. *Paris: Presses univ., 1933.* xii + 188 pp. Fr. 20.

Rudolf, P. — Frankreich im Urteil der Hamburger Zeitschriften in den Jahren 1789-1810. *Hamburg: Rom. Sem., 1934.* viii + 63 pp.

Sardou. — Mme Sans-Gêne, ed. D. C. Cabee. *New York: Holt, 1934.* xiii + 168 + xlv pp. \$0.96.

Schneider, C. — L'Activité litt. en Alsace et en Lorraine depuis la guerre. *Bordeaux: Eds. de la Renaissance provinciale, 1933.* 48 pp.

Sée, E. — Notre époque et le théâtre. *Paris: Eds. de Fr., 1933.* 355 pp. Fr. 15.

Seillière, E. — Sur la psychologie du romantisme fr. *Paris: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1933.* 260 pp. Fr. 15.

Storer, M. E. — Contes de fées du Grand Siècle. *New York: Inst. of Fr. Studies, 1934.* 182 pp.

Strentz, H. — G. de Nerval. *Paris: Nouv. Rev. crit., 1933.* 93 pp. Fr. 9.

Telger, G. — Die altfranz.: Gregoriuslegende. *Münster: Rom. Sem., 1933.* 135 pp.

Vianey, J. — Les Poèmes barbares de Leconte de Lisle. *Paris: Malfère, 1934.* 204 pp. Fr. 12.

Voltaire. — Candide, ed. G. R. Havens. *New York: Holt, 1934.* lxiii + 149 + lxi pp. \$1.00.

Wilmotte, M. — Le Poème du Gral. *Paris: Droz, 1933.* 93 pp.

Winkler, E. G. — Moderne franz.: Klassiker-aufführungen auf Pariser Bühnen. *Diss. München: 1933.* 52 pp.

ITALIAN

Acerbi, Giuseppe. — Un diario di viaggio di —: Roma-Napoli, 9 ottobre-12 novembre 1834. A cura di Emma Tedeschi. *Mantova: Stab. tip. "L'artistica," di C. Gobbi, 1933.* 65 pp.

Ariosto, Ludovico. — Orlando furioso. Edizione integra. Introduzione, testo, argomenti, indice copiosissimo, a cura di N. Zingarelli. *Milano: U. Hoepli, 1934.* lxxv + 600 pp. L. 28.

Alighieri, Dante. — La Divina Commedia. Con brevi note di L. Pietrobono. *Torino: Soc. edit. internazionale, 1933.* 746 pp. L. 10.

Bisanti, Nina. — Giovanni Alcozer, poeta siciliano. *Palermo: F.lli Corselli, 1933.* 112 pp.

Cione, E. — Francesco De Sanctis dalla Nunziatella a Castel dell'Ovo. *Napoli: A. Guida, 1933.* 62 pp. L. 10. (Repr. fr. the "Archivio storico per le provincie napoletane," vol. 58.)

Cremona-Casoli, A. — Chi è l' "Adoardo" dell'Orlando furioso (canto XLVI, stanza 18*). *Reggio Emilia: Offic. graf. fasciste, 1933.* 16 pp. (Repr. fr. "Il soleo fascista," 1933.)

Facchinetti, V. — S. Bernardino da Siena mistico sole del secolo XV. *Milano: Casa ed. S. Lega eucaristica, 1933.* xxiv + 611 pp.

Fatini, G. — Letteratura maremmana delle origini. *Siena: Lazzeri, 1933.* 107 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Buletino senese di storia patria," nuova serie 1932, fasc. II, e 1933, fasc. I.)

Fletcher, J. B. — Literature of the Italian Renaissance. *New York: The Macmillan Co., 1934.* 347 pp. \$3.00.

Flora, F. — Novelle italiane dal XIV al XX

secolo, scelte e commentate ad uso delle scuole da —. *Messina*: G. Principato, 1933. 320 pp. L. 10.

Goldoni, Carlo.—Il burbero benefico. Commedia in tre atti. A cura di P. Colombo. *Palermo*: S. Andò e figli, 1933. 112 pp. L. 2.50. (Scrittori italiani, no. 2.)

— La locandiera. Introduzione e commento di O. Castellino. *Torino*: Soc. edit. internazionale, 1933. xii + 81 pp. L. 3. (Scrittori italiani commentati per le scuole.)

Lipparini, G.—I grandi autori della letteratura italiana. Luoghi scelti dalle opere, con introduzioni, sunti di storia letteraria e commenti ad uso delle scuole medie superiori. Volume II: Parini, Alfieri, Goldoni, Monti, Foscolo. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 287 pp. L. 6.

Manzoni, Alessandro.—Liriche: Inni sacri, odi politiche, cori. Con l'intepretazione di G. De Robertis. *Firenze*: F. Le Monnier, 1933. 48 pp. L. 3.

Milazzo, Antonina.—G. Verga e il suo "Mastro don Gesualdo." *Catania*: Zuccarello e Izzi, 1933. 180 pp. L. 12.

Momigliano, A.—Storia della letteratura italiana. Vol. I: Dalle origini al Tasso. *Messina*: G. Principato, 1933. 289 pp. L. 8

Nievo, Ippolito.—Le confessioni di un italiano. Pagine scelte e ricollegate con introduzione e note di A. Marenduzzo. *Milano*: C. Signorelli, 1933. 222 pp. L. 5. (Scrittori italiani e stranieri, n. 41.)

Pasoli, L.—La personalità di Scipione Maffei e lo svolgimento dei suoi studi storici sino alla "Verona illustrata." *Venezia*: C. Ferrari, 1929. 86 pp. (Repr. fr. the "Archivio veneto," 1929.)

Peluso, G., e Ronci, L.—Fiesole e i poeti. Prefazione di U. Signorini. *Firenze*: Edizione del Gruppo di cultura fiorentino degl'Isvici, 1933. 61 pp. L. 5.

Piancastelli, C.—Saggio di una bibliografia delle tradizioni popolari della Romagna. I: Usi, costumi, credenze, pregiudizi. *Bologna*: Stab. poligr. riuniti, 1933. 112 pp.

Pindemonte, Ippolito.—Le più belle pagine, scelte da G. B. Angioletti. *Milano-Roma*: Treves-Treccani-Tumminelli, 1933. vii + 311 pp. (Le più belle pagine degli scrittori italiani scelte da scrittori viventi, no. 61.)

Segneri, Paolo.—Il quaresimale. *Alba-Roma*: Pia soc. S. Paolo, 1933. 376 pp.

Serafino, Giuseppina Maria.—Le donne dell'Orlando Furioso. *Palermo*: "Il popolo di Sicilia," 1933. 114 pp. L. 8.

Vaccalluzzo, N.—Un accademico burlesco contro un accademico togato, ossia Carlo Gozzi contro Melchior Cesarotti. Scritti inediti sulla lingua italiana e su' doveri accademici. *Livorno*: R. Giusti. xxxviii + 171 pp. L. 12.

Weidlich, C.—Nella repubblica delle lettere. *Palermo*: Casa edit. Domino, 1933. 198 pp. L. 5.

SPANISH

Aroche, C. L.—Los mejores madrigales en español. *México*: Edit. Nacionalista, 1933. 190 pp.

Carmody, F. J.—Franco-Italian sources of Roncesvalles. *New York*: Columbia University, 1934. 33 pp.

Cuevas, M.—Orígenes del humanismo en Méjico. *Méjico*: Esc. Tip. Salesiana, 1933. 74 pp.

Chabás, J.—Historia de la Literatura española. *Barcelona*: Gil, 1933. 83 pp. 4 ptas.

Ercilla y Zúñiga, A. de.—La Araucana. 2 vols. *Santiago de Chile*: Ed. Universidad de Chile, 1933. xxix + 309 y 412 pp.

Góngora y Argote, L. de.—Obras completas. Ed. de J. e I. Millé y Giménez. *Madrid*: Aguilar, [1932]. xxxv + 1343 pp. 25 ptas.

Haynes, R. A.—Negation in *Don Quijote*. *Chicago*: The University of Chicago Libraries, 1933. xi + 167 pp.

Ibarra, J. F.—Los días y las estaciones. *Buenos Aires*: Tip. Futura, 1932. 264 pp. (Importante a causa de la métrica.)

Irizar y Avilés, P. de.—Sinónimos. Repertorio de palabras usuales castellanas de sentido análogo, semejante o aproximado. 5ª ed. aumentada por H. Serís. *Barcelona*: Seix & Barral, 1932. 151 pp. 4 ptas.

Marañón, G.—El Empecinado. *Madrid*: Ed. Castro, 1932. 176 pp. 1 pta.

Martorell, R.—Trece crónicas de viajes. Por China, Mongolia, Japón, Filipinas, Bali, Siam y la India. *Madrid*: Maestre, 1933. 485 pp. 20 ptas.

Palacio Valdés, A.—Tiempos felices. Escenas de la época esponsalicia. *Madrid*: Suárez, 1933. 289 pp. 5 ptas.

Rubio, D.—La Universidad de San Marcos de Lima durante la colonización española. *Madrid*: Imp. Juan Bravo, 1933. 257 pp.

Silva Castro, R.—Fuentes bibliográficas para el estudio de la Literatura Chilena. *Santiago de Chile*: Prensas de la Universidad, 1933. 272 pp.

Smith, W. V. and R. L. Grismer.—Tales of the Spanish Southwest. *New York*: Holt, 1934. xi + 181 + l. \$0.96.

Spanisches Theater.—*Berlin*: Preussische Staatsbibliothek, 1928. (Catálogo de 9000 comedias, la mayor parte de los siglos XIX y XX.)

Usigli, R.—Méjico en el teatro. *Méjico*: Imp. Mundial, 1932. 220 pp.

Vitis, M. D. de.—Florilegio del Parnaso Americano. *Barcelona*: Maucci, 1933? 577 pp.

THE WORKS OF EDMUND SPENSER

A Variorum Edition

Edited by EDWIN GREENLAW, CHARLES GROSVENOR OSGOOD, and
FREDERICK MORGAN PADELFORD

The present edition aims to furnish an accurate text of Spenser's poetry and prose and to make accessible in convenient form the fruits of all the significant scholarship and literary criticism which have contributed to the better understanding and appreciation of this major poet. Book I of the *Faerie Queene*, prepared under the special editorship of Professor Padelford, was issued in December 1932. Book II, edited by the late Professor Greenlaw, was published in November of last year, and Book III, edited by Professor Padelford, has just been issued. The *Faerie Queene* is to be completed in six volumes of about 500 pages each. The volumes, not to be sold separately, will be billed as issued at \$6.00 net the volume.

"The book is admirably produced—well printed, good paper, and with that 'excellent thing' in books (not always achieved by American publications) no undue weight. Considering how much has been got into the volume in the shape of text, commentary, appendixes (some nine in number not including that on the text) it is surprising that the volume is so agreeable to use, so manageable in the hand, as well as pleasing to the eye. . . . This volume supplies the requisite materials for all further discussion of the subject. It is a great achievement of American scholarship, both in its production at this difficult time, and in the evidence it bears to the large part that the American scholars have borne in all recent work on Spenser. One can but hope that it will receive the welcome it deserves and find a place in every library."

—H. J. C. GRIERSON, *The University, Edinburgh*

A prospectus showing specimen pages will be sent upon request

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS · BALTIMORE

HEATH'S STANDARD FRENCH AND ENGLISH DICTIONARY

Edited by *J. E. Mansion*. The first large, comprehensive, and *up-to-date* French Dictionary to be produced in thirty years. Indispensable to teachers, general and departmental libraries, and to all serious students of the French language. Scholarly and rich in new material relating to language, literature, science, technology, the industries, the arts, and the professions.

Part I. French-English. 928 pages. Sold separately, net \$11.00

Part II. English-French. (In preparation). Sold separately, net \$10.00

Subscription price for 2 volumes ordered together, net \$20.00

Carriage prepaid

8" x 11" Buckram Binding

Boston D. C. HEATH AND COMPANY New York
Chicago Atlanta San Francisco Dallas London

A Spring Publication

NINETEENTH CENTURY FRENCH READINGS, VOL. I

Edited by **ALBERT SCHINZ**, University of Pennsylvania.

Representative selections of prose and poetry from the greatest writers of the first half of the nineteenth century. The rise and decline of the Romantic movement is the unifying theme on which the selections are based. The authors included are Joseph de Maistre, Chateaubriand, Madame de Staël, Benjamin Constant, Lamartine, Victor Hugo, Alfred de Vigny, Alfred de Musset, George Sand, Michelet, Béranger, Stendhal, Mérimée and Balzac.

HENRY HOLT AND COMPANY
NEW YORK - - CHICAGO - - SAN FRANCISCO